THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

O. 11. FEBRUARY, 1930. VOL. XIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

TTER HYMNS PREVAILING.

Many things check the advance of true religion, and not st the hymns which are still sung at our church services. The dity, materialism, and sickly sentimentality of their utter- es, is the greatest enemy to truthful, spiritual teaching in the pit and classroom. A deliverer from this baneful influence peared in the form of *Songs of Praise* published by the Ox- d University Press in 1925. It contained 449 hymns and a zen or so of doxologies. Its collection of hymns was so good t we felt that there were not above a dozen in it which we uld like to see excluded from it, and we knew of very few t we should care to have added to it. Its music, while retain- many good, popular tunes, added a number of new ones of ery high order.

It is cheering and significant to learn that in the four years ce its publication, it has had a quite phenomenal success. A m of it, abridged for Council schools, is being adopted by e educational authority after another. One county alone has lered 100,000 copies.

This means that the rising generation will grow up to appre- te a different kind of music and sacred verse from that from ich the older generation have suffered, and in a number of es revolted. The increasing sales of the abridged edition of *ngs of Praise* has rendered it possible for the Oxford Univer- Press to increase the size of the congregational book to nething over 600 hymns—the normal size of present-day

hymnals. There are, however, dangers about enlargement. may, unless carried out very judiciously, lower the standard the book. Sir Henry Hadow, we believe, once described *Son of Praise* as 'a perfect combination of music and letters.' V have good hope that it will continue to deserve such high co mendation.

The editors, chief of whom is Professor Dearmer, propo to enlarge it, not by a mere appendix (though the new matt we understand, will be obtainable in that form), but by a co plete re-casting of the book.

When removing some of their present hymns, and adding choice collection of new ones, we hope that, regardless of t outcry of literary purists, who demand that hymns shall be p served in the form in which they left their author's pen, they w courageously and discreetly modify some of the hymns wh they will certainly retain in their new edition. For instance, t beautiful hymn, 'And now, O Father, mindful of the lo (141), is spoilt by the lines :

> 'For lo! between our sins and their reward
> We set the Passion of thy Son our Lord.'

which is a virtual denial of the truth that Christ's Atonement be effective needs to be wrought *in* us as well as *for* us.

The Immediate Future of English Religion.

Dr. Barnes in the first number of the *Monthly Messen* to the Birmingham Diocese deals with the immediate future English Religion. In view of its recent advance, the Bish predicts that the predominance of Modernism will be the ch acteristic feature of the English Christianity of the coming a The Modernist principles, which the Bishop stresses in this c nection, he describes briefly as follows :

> (1) The Creative Process, by which alike stars and men have b fashioned, is a unity. The Process is unthinkable as a mechanism. is purposive. Behind it lie not only Power, but also Intelligence. M over, because its outcome on earth is man, with his ethical ideals aspirations, Creative Purpose is moral. Thus we arrive at Chri intuition that God, the creator and ground of all, is our Father.
>
> (2) Further, the Universe is, for our thought, rational. Yet it w be profoundly irrational were man's life to end with the grave. must then accept that doctrine of a future life which is centra Christ's teaching.

(3) Christ's teaching of man's duty which is associated with the phrase 'the Kingdom of Heaven' naturally follows from belief in the Fatherhood of God.

(4) That we are morally free, and therefore responsible to God for our actions, follows from our constant and invariable experience of life. Thus there is no escape from the severity of Christ's teaching with regard to wrong-doing.

(5) The appeal of Christ, and the ground of our reverence for Him, must be based on what in our highest moments we feel to be His spiritual knowledge and authority. His power to reveal God and to guide mankind. All extraneous credentials are of slight value.

Such briefly is the positive faith of Modernism. On its negative side it rejects *in toto* the dualisms of popular and of traditional thought.

(1) It refuses to cut the Universe into two parts, a natural and a supernatural. The whole is God's. His guidance and rule are everywhere, save where the freedom which He allows His creatures conflicts with His purpose.

(2) Modernism similarly refuses to oppose the sacraments of the Church to those of Nature. God reveals Himself in many ways. The Holy Communion is not invariably superior to, nor is it different in kind from, other channels of Divine grace.

(3) Similarly, Modernism refuses to sever Jesus from humanity. He was God *and man*. The union was possible because in all men some degree of divine indwelling can take place. Of course in such a doctrine the Modernist is reaffirming the purest orthodoxy of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.

(4) Once again Modernism refuses to allow that the Bible is different from other collections of books in that it is miraculously free from error. The Modernist finds in the Bible a quality and range of spiritual excellence unequalled elsewhere. But the writers and teachers whose message it gives made mistakes, for they were human. We must search out the gold: what remains can be ignored.

ıe Bishop is conscious of the disintegrating effect of new knowdge on traditional Christian belief and doctrine, and feels that ly the Modernist attitude towards this new knowledge can rn it to good use in the spheres of belief and morality, so that will help and not harm the Christian Church in its mission to ınkind.

In view of the advances of Modernism the Bishop fears that ıile to the older Modernists their transition from Traditionaln to Modernism was a matter of much mental, moral, and iritual effort, it will become a facile matter as it becomes more neral. This makes him anxious. The Modernist faith he lues is won hardly, and is only held by going repeatedly to e depths of religious experience. A conventional, second-nd Modernism would, in comparison with it, be a valueless

and dangerous possession, and would prove to be the harbing of an age of latitudinarian indifference. We hope not. It wou be a sorry result that truth, so hardly won, should be so ligh held. Both Bishop Butler and Dr. Arnold took too depress a view of their contemporary ecclesiastical situation. If Mode ism, as there seems good reason to believe, should ultimat win through, although not without a great deal of prelimin educational work, we must hope that it will not then relapse i a mere repetition of vapid shibboleths, and lose its moral a spiritual force. There is no real reason why broad views shou be shallow ones; why truth should be less active than falsehoo why adherents of a gospel of freedom and divine love should less willing to give unselfish service to mankind than the b lievers in an angry God, who demands expiatory sacrifices a condemns the bulk of mankind to hell. The present religio and moral situation may abound with disturbing symptoms, b it is also full of hope.

JEWS AND CHRISTIANS AND THE TRINITY.

The current number of the *Hibbert Journal* contains t exceedingly interesting papers which were read at the rec Conference of Jews and Christians held at the City Temple November 27th. The first is by Mr. C. G. Montefiore on 'Je ish Conceptions of Christianity,' the second by Professor F. Burkitt on 'What Christians think of Jews.' Both articles written by remarkable men, and both articles are remarkable a very singular degree in their insight and charm.

Having pointed out that to Christian eyes, Judaism seems many ways, not so much wrong as incomplete, a one-sided, l sided, broken off, sterilized and fossilized kind of religion, a that to the Jew Christianity appears to be not only false fraudulent; the religion of love which has greatly hated; religion of forgiveness which has never forgiven. Mr. Mon fiore pleads for the admission that each religion may have so thing to learn from the other; something in which the oth though in other respects inferior, yet excels in this. For ample, the Jew holds that the Doctrine of the Trinity is posed to the Unity of God, whereas the Christian holds that Jewish conception of the Divine Unity is only truly and a

ately represented by the doctrine of the Trinity. But, pleads r. Montefiore: Might not Christians allow that there is a luable, and even a true, element in Jewish Unitarianism, which often neglected or inadequately expressed in Christian Trini- ianism? When we turn to Professor Burkitt's article we find n also dealing with the Trinity and asking the Jew to study sympathetically. He writes:

> 'It is forbidden,' says the now unpopular "Athanasian" Creed, to say *There be three Gods*. This is, and always has been, the Christian doctrine. What I ask is that you should not regard the Christian orthodox doctrine of the Trinity as a relapse into Polytheism. Possibly the doctrine is not perfectly expressed, possibly—nay, certainly—it has often been misunderstood by imperfectly instructed Christians, but its intention is not polytheistic. It rather corresponds to those amazing speculations of our modern scientific guides who tell us to regard simple atoms as containing within themselves complexities comparable to the solar system . . . The Christian formula is an attempt to co-ordinate the special Divine element in man and the special Divine element which Christians believe to have been in Jesus, with the mysterious Divine Reality which both Jews and Christians believe to govern all things . . . Our Christian co-ordination may be incoherent . . . but its intention is, in the literal sense of the word, Unitarian; it attempts to gather together the various sides of Christian religious experience within the dogma, common to Jews and Christians, of the Unity of God.'

It is a useful and indeed remarkable Conference which can oduce a discussion of this kind in the presence of a company Jews and Christians. Things have advanced since the days ıen Justin Martyr had his famous *Dialogue with one Trypho Jew.*

St. Paul's ideal of the Church of Christ, as presented in the *pistle to the Ephesians*, that it should be the means of uniting w and Gentile in a divine fellowship in which the old differ- ıces of race and religion would be transcended, is nearer alization than it was in St. Paul's day, and in the modern wish world none have done more to bring Christian and Jew gether on the moral and spiritual plane than Mr. Montefiore, e revered founder of Liberal Judaism in England.

'OMEN AND THE PRIESTHOOD.

In a compact volume by Dr. Mahoney, just published with preface by Cardinal Bourne,* the Roman Catholic objection

* Published by Burnes, Oates, and Washbourne, 6/- (1930).

to admitting women to the priesthood is clearly stated. D
Mahoney writes :

'We live in an age when the Apostolic injunction that "wom
keep silence in the churches" is disregarded. Many non-Cathol
welcome their ministration, and people are beginning to ask whet
it would not be an excellent thing for women to receive ordinati
like men. They could bring into the public service of God, in the ca
of the sick and in dealing intimately with their own sex, qualificatic
which men do not possess.

'There is no need to confuse the issue by discussing the increasi
tendency of women, in modern times, to assume various offices a
rights which we have been accustomed, in the past, to seeing exercis
only by men. It may be good or not. People are entitled to hold th
own views on this as on many other subjects. Nor need a Catholic
unduly alarmed or disturbed at seeing women undertake minister
functions in non-Catholic Churches. A female priesthood is amo
the vagaries of some very early heresies. The priesthood is denied
women, not because of some defect inherent in their character, r
because they are physically unable to perform the priestly functior
on the contrary, a woman may be considered more heroic in self-sac
fice, more devout, more persuasive than a man. Women are incapa
of participating in the priestly character of Christ solely because Chri
"who did all things well," elected to choose men, not women, for t
particular office in His service. If any one woman were fitted for
office, it was the one who is blest amongst them all. Yet our La
received none of the priestly prerogatives granted to the Apostl
That Christ did not will to ordain women priests is evident from
Gospels and from the universal teaching of the Church, which h
always held a female priesthood in abhorrence as reminiscent of pag
ism. The term "priestess," which is met with occasionally in ea
documents, refers to the wife of a priest, in days before the law
celibacy obtained throughout the Western Church.

'On the other hand, although incapable of priestly ordination,
position of women in the active service of the Church was recogni
and established in Apostolic times. They assisted at the baptism
women, ministered to the sick, and kept order in the portion of
church used by women. They were often known as deaconesses, a
were occasionally constituted in their office by some ceremony rese
bling ordination. Holy women ministered to Christ in His earthly li
they outnumbered men in their courageous following of our Savi
to the foot of the Cross: they were among the first witnesses of
glorious resurrection. Alone of all human beings Mary was concei
immaculate. Following her example, they have, in every period of
Church's history, continued to help the cause of Christ by their praye
by their holy lives, and by every kind of assistance rendered to
service of God. If Christ did not elect to call them to the priestho
it is because He has designed for them other work in His service. Ev
priest, like St. Paul, has used their indispensable help, and rememb
with gratitude "those women that have laboured with me in the Gos
whose names are in the book of life."'

To refuse to admit women to the priesthood on the ground t
our Lord had no women in the band of His Apostles is a v

eak reason. It would be as reasonable to exclude women from
ie Eucharist because no woman was present at its institution,
or is there any explicit instance in the New Testament of women
eceiving the Eucharistic elements.

We know that in the Apostolic Church there were, like the
aughters of Philip, women who were prophets. If women were
ble to be prophets, and received the Holy Spirit for that pur-
ose, how much more might they not be able to be priests, for
i that Apostolic Church prophets ranked next to Apostles.

If the Modernist hesitates to advocate the admission of
omen to the priesthood, it is for quite other reasons. He recog-
izes with St. Paul that 'in Christ' there is 'neither male nor
emale.' But because women are morally and spiritually equal
o men, that is not in itself a reason for admitting women to the
riesthood. The real question is a practical one. Would having
omen as priests increase the influence of the Church in which
ney ministered? It would not do it at the present time in the
Church of England. This may be a severe reflection on the moral
nd spiritual condition of the Church of England, but never-
heless it is the case. We know that 'in Christ' there is 'neither
ond nor free,' yet there have been Churches in which those of
ie servile class were not ordained, because, were they in Holy
Orders, they would carry no weight in their community. No
oubt the Church should be educated out of such a state, but
iat would not be done by ordaining slaves, but by raising slaves
i every way to the level of free men. Until women in public
ffices and professions are more generally regarded as being as
fficient and as influential and as desirable as men, it would be
mistake to ordain them to the exercise of the priesthood as
ien exercise it in the Church of England.

If women would be content for a generation or so to be or-
ained priests and to minister solely to communities of women
nd children, that would prove the best and surest stepping-stone
o the unrestricted priesthood which men are permitted to exer-
ise. Another condition which ought to be imposed in the ex-
erimental stage is that the priesthood of women should be
onfined to unmarried women or widows. No married woman,
specially one with a family, should be a priest.

Besides the obvious practical difficulties in the way of ad-

mitting women to the priesthood, there are certain psychologica difficulties. These need serious investigation extending over considerable period of time. Women must, it seems to us, exer cise much more influence in public posts than they do to-day before they can take the place of the male parish priest—eve though he be not, as he would be the first to admit, a very fin example of ministerial efficiency and influence.

It is recognized that it is very difficult to secure to-day any thing like the full number of men of the right type to enter th ministry. If the ordination of women to the priesthood wer begun, it would lead to a further serious fall in the number o male ordinands, and also, we believe, in the numbers of ou congregations, and especially in Anglo-Catholic circles. It i lawful to have women priests, but certainly at present it is no expedient.

A Layman's Protest against Disestablishment.

Sir Charles Marston has done good service by the compila tion of his booklet, *A Candid Examination of 'The Crisis.'* I consists of succinct statements and luminous quotations.

In view of some recent episcopal utterances flouting th authority of Parliament in relation to the Church, it is importan to recall the following assurances made in Parliament by the ex Archbishop and the present Archbishop of Canterbury:

Dr. Davidson said, as reported in *The Times*, December 1 1919:

> 'If it was still supposed by any that the Bill when passed would ter to impair the national character of the Church of England, he wou never have made himself responsible for the Measure. But he believe the very opposite; . . . they were definitely and in set terms limit by the will of Parliament.'

Dr. Cosmo Lang, during the second reading of the Enablin Bill in the House of Lords, said:—

> 'The Bill in no way affected the rights of any English layman in r gard to the National Church. The effective influence of the people England was exercised by their representation in Parliament, and the was nothing in the Bill which affected the position of Parliament the ultimate source of the sanctions which must be given to a changes affecting the Church of England in regard to its Constitutio or its relations to the Statutory Law of the country. The only chan that was made was a change of procedure.'

Sir Charles deals next with the unrepresentative character of ne House of Laity which helped to bring about 'the crisis' by oting for the Deposited Book. Besides pointing to the absurdly mall number of Church people who elect the House of Laity, ir Charles notes a further disqualification. This he finds in the estricted outlook of the Diocesan Electoral Colleges:

> 'They consist for the most part of men and women too closely associated with the Bishops and Clergy to have before them the state of religious feeling and activity outside the ecclesiastical circle. They rarely represent at all the average layman. It is as though County Societies, the social friends of the House of Lords, chose the House of Commons!'

He aptly cites Dr. Henson's comment on the situation in 1923:

> 'For the first time since the Reformation the clerical factor is dominant in the Church of England, for the authority of the nation, which in theory remains unchanged, is probably incapable of exercise.'

The Prayer Book crisis, Sir Charles shows, was incurred (1) y the well-intentioned but unstatesmanlike policy of the Bishops: (2) by the long-standing grievances of the laity with nany of the parochial clergy who introduced Romanizing rites; endered the Prayer-Book services perfunctorily; preached oorly; and neglected house-to-house visitation. His charges gainst the clergy he supports by two citations from Dr. Henson:

> 'The parishioners have been amazingly patient. All over the country the parish churches are being emptied by the introduction of Anglo-Catholic innovations. . . . The parishioners, wronged or ignored, have either fallen out of religious observances altogether, or betaken themselves to the Nonconformist Churches. They have been defrauded of their birthright in the Church of England.'
>
> 'I am not convinced that the general abandonment of house-to-house visitation is as unavoidable as the clergy seem to assume. . . . The clergy are severing almost the only personal link which connects them with many, even with most, of their parishioners, and are in fact tacitly surrendering the conception of the pastoral charge which is traditional in the Church of England.'

3) By the strong party-feeling in the Church, of which Sir John Birchall wrote:

> 'I say unhesitatingly that that Measure was defeated mainly by our own unhappy divisions.'

But Disestablishment, which would involve the loss of some nillions of pounds sterling to an impoverished Church, would bviously only make matters worse, especially when the great ulk of the laity are opposed to Disestablishment. No lover of ur National Church acquainted with the feeble denominational

position of the Churches of the Anglican Communion in the Dominions and the United States, would wish to reduce the Church of England to that position.

In dealing with this issue, Sir Charles cites with effect the words of the Primate of the Church of Ireland in his notable address on October 3rd, 1928:

> 'Are Church and State to be driven into opposition by rash and ill-advised action? Remember that in great countries Church and State are more or less in continual conflict. The freedom of England from that disastrous condition has been due to the fact that the English people, with their profound common sense and their happy disregard of the abstract doctrines of the theorists, have always determined to be masters in their own house and to have their own National Church. The real meaning of the Establishment of the Church of England is just that it expresses the Christian Faith of the nation. It is the nation on the religious side. Some theorists, in order to throw discredit on all this, call it Erastian. Calling names is always a stupid form of argument. But Erastianism is really not the correct description. Call it organic, and the relation between Church and State in England becomes clear. The people of England inherited their Faith, and inherited their Church, as essentials of the national life, and there is no sign that they want to part with these great possessions.'

In opposing Dr. Temple's motion, which will only serve to prolong a thoroughly unprofitable controversy, Sir Charles maintains that the Church, which is itself to blame for the existing situation, is 'now trying to lay the blame on the State.'

His concluding paragraphs, addressed to his fellow-members of the Church Assembly, will, we hope, strengthen the opposition to Dr. Temple's motion to enquire into the existing relations between Church and State:

> 'Illustrious Members of this House have suffered themselves to be led away by a bureaucracy, and the true issues have been obscured and confused with catch phrases, like "Spiritual liberty" and "Authority." Sound judgment and perspective are sacrificed to wounded feelings and pique. Such are the conditions which provoke the reckless assumption that the Church should be disestablished.'

A Church and State Commission.

On February 5th, the following resolution, moved by Dr Temple in the Church Assembly, was carried by 382 votes to 105; there were 229 abstentions:

> 'That whereas, in the words addressed to the Church Assembly on July 2, 1928, by Archbishop Davidson with the concurrence of the whole body of Diocesan Bishops, "It is a fundamental principle that the Church—that is, the bishops together with the clergy and laity—must

in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship" :

It is desirable that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into the present relations of Church and State, and particularly how far the principle stated above is able to receive effective application in present circumstances in the Church of England, and what legal and constitutional changes, if any, are needed in order to maintain or to secure its effective application : and that the Archbishops be requested to appoint a Commission for this purpose.'

In a notable leading article *The Times* strongly deprecated the appointment of the Commission, and in so doing it voiced the feelings of the bulk of the English laity. Episcopal and clerical opinion, however, seems to be emphatically in favour of the Commission. This fact fails to inspire us with confidence in the soundness of the policy. Guizot wrote :

'A people who can understand and act upon the counsels that God has given it in the past events of its history is safe in the most disastrous crisis of its fate.'

This does not seem to have been a characteristic of what Mr. Birrell has called 'the troublesome history' of the Church of England. Ever since the days when Archbishop Laud's policy of 'Thorough' brought upon his beloved Church the almost overwhelming 'Root and Branch' reprisals, episcopal policy has consistently taken the wrong turning in every great crisis which the Church has faced — except one, the Romanizing policy of James II. That our Church survives until to-day is indeed a miracle of grace, but it is not the grace of episcopacy which has saved it, but the saving grace of common sense exhibited by the loyal, patient, religious English laity. As the great Chancellor of England, Clarendon, looked back on the cause he strove, but failed, to render victorious, and called to mind the injudicious zeal of the creators of the opposition which had overwhelmed them all, he wrote :

'The clergy understand the least and take the worst measure of human affairs of all men that can write and read.'

To risk the moral, spiritual and material blessings of establishment and to invite the inevitable dangers and disasters which must follow on disestablishment for the fatuities of what is euphemistically called 'spiritual freedom,' but is closely akin to 'the right divine of kings to govern wrong' — in this case not

kings, but bishops—is, we fear, adding but one more to the wrong turnings down which the bishops have led our National Church in its weary pilgrimage.

There is, however, 'balm in Gilead': the Church Assembly proceedings called forth from the Primate a memorable statement that by supporting the resolution it was not to be understood that he desired or sought disestablishment. *The Times* (Feb. 6) reports His Grace as saying:

> 'The motion was in no sort of way a movement towards disestablishment. He certainly shared what he believed to be the feeling of the bulk of the Assembly, and certainly of Church people without those doors, that they did not desire disestablishment.'

Dr. Temple also uttered a word of good cheer when he indicated that the Commission would require some five years in which to accomplish its task. This will give the present agitation a chance to settle down and provide the bishops with adequate time in which to restore order, or, if not that, at least the opportunity of learning the best way in which to do it. Although we believe that fresh legislation is needful to accomplish the restoration of order, yet we place much greater hope in education than in legislation, and a good deal can be done educationally in five years.

The Popularization of Modernist Teaching.

The Modern Churchmen's Union in the person of their editor, the Rev. R. G. Griffith, a hard-worked parish priest, are to be congratulated on the issue of their 'What we believe Series' of penny tracts.* The tracts consist of sixteen pages of clearly-printed matter and are suitable for readers of ordinary education. We hope that large numbers will be bought especially for sale on Church book-stalls. Perhaps the best to begin with, although it is tenth in the series, is *The Religious Values of Modernism*, by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, a valued contributor to our pages. We are told repeatedly that Modernism is destructive, and negative, and intellectualist. The same might be said of the Gospel. 'Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up,' presents an important aspect of our Lord's Mission. It is to Him we owe the injunction to love God 'with all thy mind'; it is not in the Old Testament form of the first and great commandment. A destructive, nega-

* Orpington Press, 173 High Street, Orpington, Kent.

ive, and intellectual aspect in Christ's Gospel did not deprive t of moral and spiritual values, and Mr. Fawkes' tract gives he impression that the same is true of Modernism.

There are three of many points, which this brilliant writer nakes, which deserve particular attention.

(1) The first stresses the besetting sin of the theologians. Of his Mr. Fawkes writes:

> 'The besetting sin of theologians is over-statement: when we teach, our teaching must be a teaching which can be believed.
>
> '"Over-statements of the doctrine of the Atonement, and, in recent years, of that of the Church and the Sacraments, have defeated the purpose with which they were made." The extreme logical statement of a doctrine is never true, for it is only arrived at by eliminating factors. And the importation of magical and mechanical conceptions into religion is a very real danger. "I heard the other day" (says Bishop Headlam in his well-known work, *The Church of England*), "of a Suffragan Bishop who explained confirmation by the analogy of a photograph. Before the click of the photographer, the plate has nothing on it; after the click there is the impression. Language like this is most harmful: it is saying what the majority of people can't believe, and won't believe, and ought not to believe." Similar conceptions are found among those Catholic theologians who tell us that a priest has the power "to make (*conficere*) the Body and Blood of Christ" in the Eucharist. Such beliefs are Pagan, not Christian; the Christian approach to religion is from the ethical side.'

(2) We have on several occasions heard Traditionalist clergymen declare that they had never met a Modernist housemaid. The remark, if uttered in public, was invariably applauded (laughter and cheers). We remember, however, the case of a housemaid, who said that as she listened to the sermons of a certain Professor of King's College, London, she got the impression of drawing up blinds and opening windows. As the Professor was believed in Church circles to be a heretic, we may not unjustly draw the inference, that the housemaid was a Modernist. Mr. Fawkes deals with a similar case. He writes:

> 'It is sometimes asked, as if the objection (for the question takes the shape of an objection) were unanswerable, what message of comfort a Modernist would have for the dying. Well, he would certainly not talk of controversy—he would say nothing about the Virgin Birth, or the Real Presence, or the Apostolical Succession, or the Pope. Perhaps the less we know of these things the better; and, in any case, to speak of them would not be "to speak to the condition" of one on the threshold of eternity. No. *Proficiscere anima christiana,* he would pray with the Church's office: "Go forth, O Christian soul, from this world in the name of God the Father Almighty Who hath created thee;

in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, who suffered for thee; in the name of the Holy Spirit who has been poured forth in thee." He would, I think, refer him to the 23rd Psalm, "The Lord is my Shepherd"; or to the parable of the Prodigal Son: here is religion; here is the mind of Christ.'

(3) The third point we desire to call attention to in Mr. Fawkes' tract, deals with the function of the intellect in religion. There are many people who think it has no function at all, and not a few of them are priests. If what Mr. Fawkes says is true, and he cites in support of it Baron von Hügel, it will account for the weakness of religion and morality in a number of our modern communities. He writes:

'The rationalizing of religion is accompanied by its spiritualizing; the two move on parallel lines. Popular religion, indeed, will always be corrupt: it is imperfectly rational and imperfectly ethical; religion, like gold, cannot be coined without a mixture of alloy. But the less the better; the debasement of the coinage is a public crime. The consideration for the weak brother enjoined by the Apostle has been overdone. "Him that is weak in faith, receive ye; yet not to doubtful disputation." For the mental weakness of these brethren is counterbalanced by their numerical preponderance. The institutional and emotional elements in religion, had they their way, would crowd out the rational and the genuinely religious: "Many oxen are come about me; fat bulls of Basan close me in on every side."

'In his great book, *The Mystical Element in Religion*, Baron von Hügel discusses the special motives at work in each of the three elements in religion—the institutional, the experimental, and the speculative—towards the suppression of the other two. The success of the effort to oust any of the three would be disastrous.

'What he says is, in effect, this: that the moral and spiritual side of our nature will, more than any other, constantly require three things: *Rest, Expression* and *Purification*: and that our intellectual activities, if they are kept vigorous and independent, are in a position to supply these requirements. Nothing else can. (1) They *rest* the moral and spiritual demands of human nature, because the two kinds —the intellectual and the moral or the spiritual—move on different lines. (2) The former (the intellectual) *express* the results of the latter (the moral and spiritual), because religious facts and experiences, like all other facts, require to be continually stated and re-stated by the intellect, in terms intelligible to the civilization and culture of the successive ages of the world. (3) Above all, they can *purify* these results because they interpose a zone of abstraction, of cool, clear thinking between the direct information given by the senses and the inspirations of the moral and spiritual nature which constitute the Person. Thus this intellectual and abstractive element, if neither minimised in the life of the soul, nor allowed to be its sole or last element, is a sobering purifying, mortifying, vivifying bath and fire.'

What we have cited is somewhere about a farthing's worth of this excellent penny tract.

BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM.'

The *Nineteenth Century* for February contains an extremely teresting article by Major Polson Newman on 'The Church f England in Jerusalem.' The description of the work done y the English Bishop in Jerusalem and by the officials of St. eorge's Cathedral shows us the English Church at its best oing work which is essentially Christian and in a way which is ssentially English. In Jerusalem the Church of England mis- on is a centre of light and love : it exists to foster co-operation nd mutual understanding; to promote the moral, spiritual, in- llectual, and physical welfare of all, irrespective of creed and ace, who are willing to avail themselves of its services. One xample cited of this work has an added interest because Dr. anby is the translator of that striking book Klausner's *Jesus f Nazareth*, written in Hebrew by a Palestinian Jew. Major olson Newman writes :

> 'One of the canons of St. George's is specially appointed as an expert in Jewish work, and the bishop, knowing the unfriendly attitude of the Jews towards Christianity as a result of centuries of persecution, asked this canon to make himself fully acquainted with the Jewish hopes for a National Home in Palestine and to form points of contact with the educated and leading Jews of all classes. Dr. Herbert Danby set to work nine years ago, and the contacts which he has formed have at least shown that the Church is sympathetic and friendly to all the finer aspirations of Jewish life. He met the Jews on common ground—in literature, scholarship, Oriental study, and music, in all of which he is an expert—with the result that he has now formed lasting friendships with many of the most intellectual and cultured Jews in Palestine, and has even been asked by the leading Zionists to publish lectures given by him on the Jewish attitude towards Christianity. This is ample proof that a considerable step forward has been taken in the creation of a better atmosphere, and it is significant that Dr. Danby has become so prominent in Jewish intellectual activity that he is helping to supervise the completion of a *Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* compiled by the late Eliezer Ben Yehudah, the Jewish genius who was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the revival of the Hebrew language. It is also intended that a canon of St. George's should become an expert in work on the Moslem side, but owing to financial difficulties this side of the work has not yet been fully regularized, although Moslem relations are efficiently maintained and promoted by the bishop himself and by members of the mission staff with a knowledge or the Arabic language. The relations between St. George's close and the Moslem religious hierarchy are very cordial, and an example of the mutual sympathy existing between the two religious bodies is to be found in the fact that the Anglican bishop was one of the first to offer his congratulations to King Hussein on his assumption of the caliphate in 1924, on which occasion he was decorated

by the King of the Hedjaz. Both the Jewish and Moslem work i carried out by missionaries specially trained in their particular branches by means of schools and colleges which attract ever-increasing num bers, and by the services of St. Luke's Hospital, which has recentl been moved from Haifa to Hebron. Education and medical treatmer are irrespective of race and religion, and while St. Luke's Hospita treats in-patients and out-patients, Moslems and Jews, as well a native Christians, and provides visitations to the sick of the neighbou ing villages, St. George's School educates boys of British, Palestinian American, Armenian, German, Swedish, Russian, Persian, and Iraq nationality, representing the Anglican, Jewish, Moslem, Greek Orthc dox, Roman Catholic, Syrian Orthodox, Abyssinian and Baha'i rel gions. From every point of view it is impossible to speak too highl of St. George's School in Jerusalem, which offers to Oriental youth be he Christian, Moslem or Jew, the best that Britain has to give.'

The article concludes with a vivid picture of the unite thanksgiving service held in St. George's every year on Decem ber 9th to celebrate the liberation of Jerusalem by Lord Allenby

'This impressive and unique ceremony has been attended by th High Commissioner and the heads of the Palestine Administration, a well as by the Moslem mayor and the chief notables of the city. Th Patriarchs of the Greek Orthodox and Armenian Churches hav attended and taken part in the service. The leading ecclesiastical dig nitaries of the Syrian, Coptic, and Abyssinian Churches have seat by the high altar. The Grand Mufti, Chief Rabbi, and representative of the Arab and Jewish communities have formed part of the congrega tion, and the consuls of the foreign Powers have attended, irrespectiv of the Church to which they belong. Parts of the service are conducte in English, others in Arabic, Hebrew, Greek, and Armenian; and di ferences of race, creed, and language are no obstacle to unity of pu pose. Nowhere else in the world is it possible annually to witness procession of patriarchs, with full robes and decorations, all of differer Churches, entering an Anglican cathedral at the invitation of an An glican bishop, fully robed with cope and mitre. The sun-lit cloister form a dignified background to this brilliant procession of peace as passes along headed by the *kawasses* of the different patriarchates an consulates, dressed in their rich Oriental uniforms. The High Com missioner's guard of honour is drawn up at attention in the quadrangle the Union Jack flies from the masthead of St. George's close; and th strains of the National Anthem mark the opening of this universa thanksgiving in the Holy City.'

THE ABOLISHING OF WAR

By the Reverend Samuel McComb, D.D.

'Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.—*Isiah* ii, 4; *Micah* iv, 3.

I.

The exact date of this prophecy cannot be determined. Some mpetent students of the Old Testament date it in the eighth ntury B.C., and they think it was written by Isaiah in his old e. What kind of a world was it in which he prophesied? It as a world of blood and terror. Palestine, like modern Bel-um, was the highway across which from time to time swept asses of soldiery bent on rapine and conquest. The Assyrians ere among the most ruthless of invaders. They massacred, rtured and starved the population; cruelly and relentlessly ey laid waste the land. One might say that war was the normal der of things, broken now and again by periods of precarious eace. Yet it was in that world that the prophet lifted up his oice and uttered words that must have sounded the merest ockery to all but the noblest and the most far-sighted of his ntemporaries. How could he in such times have declared with ncerity and conviction the abolition of war? For one all suffic-g reason—*he believed in God*; that is, in the rule of a righteous ill among the affairs of men, and therefore in the ultimate umph of God's righteousness. Was he a visionary? Yes, but the type whose visions pierce through the husk of things to e core of divine reality. Was he a dreamer? Yes, but one ose dreams were the fruit of divine inspiration and therefore stined to fulfilment. His mighty proclamation was this—War all cease, for God has decreed it. In so proclaiming he was tering a word of faith which embodied the deep needs and pirations of man, and his faith was grounded on the conviction at war was out of harmony with the divine purpose of man's istence. For what is war? Tear from it its tinsel glory, its omp and circumstance,' and look at it in all its bestial reality, d then ask 'What is it'? Loss and wrong and evil incalcul-le and unimaginable. A vast mass of gold is squandered by e nations every year in paying for past wars and in piling up

armaments through fear of future wars. Suppose, then, tha this nightmare of fear could be lifted from the heart of th nations, what a fund of wealth and of redeeming energy woul be set free to aid the fight against disease, poverty, ignoranc and crime. Take the problem of disease alone. There ar diseases which condemn hundreds of thousands every year to lingering death, and sometimes to dreadful anguish. Expert tell us that if only material help in sufficient abundance wer forthcoming tuberculosis would be wiped out in fifty years, an as for cancer—the most agonising of modern scourges—medica science believes that given time and money enough it will solv the problem. In the meantime the nations amass their arma ments and squander their wealth through fear of war. This fea may be pronounced to be one of the most intractable obstacle to the moral and social progress of mankind.

Not only is war sheer loss, it is out of harmony with th growing humanitarianism of our time and it is, therefore, a anachronism. 'What!' you say, 'had the Allied nations no caus of offence against Germany when they took up her challenge an banded themselves against her? Did they go to war without an reasonable excuse?' To say so, of course, would be to sa something against all the evidence, but that is to mistake th real point, which is that among civilised peoples a peaceful solu tion ought to be always possible. The men responsible for fai ing to find it were the statesmen and politicians of Europe. An our heroic youth paid the price of their failure. As they pai it the more thoughtful among them felt that there was some thing tragically wrong somewhere. Here is an extract from letter written by a young British officer on the day before he wa killed which I owe to a published utterance of Dean Inge

> 'Having been about all night digging, I was shifted to make roo for some other company. I advanced to a cemetery to defend it. It a beastly thing to have to do—digging trenches among graves an pulling down crosses and wreaths to make room. One feels that som thing is wrong when a man lies down behind a child's grave to sho at a bearded German who has probably got a family anxiously awaitin his return home. It was a miserable day spent in a cemetery und these conditions. There was a large crucifix at one end: the sight bullets chipping Christ's image and the knowledge of what He h done for us and the Germans, and what we are doing to His consecrat ground and each other, makes one feel sick of the whole war—or sick than before.'

What this young man felt we are all now asserting. There

mething tragically wrong—not only in the political, but also the religious world—when to-day amid so much moral and igious enlightenment, men betake themselves to such a stupid d irrational method of settling a quarrel. I say 'in the reli- ous world,' for when we look back over history we are bound confess—a dreadful confession for a man standing in a Chris- n pulpit to make—that some of the bloodiest conflicts ever ught have been waged at the bidding or with the moral sup- rt of men who called themselves Christians. Mr. Lecky, one the most careful and impartial of historians, has brought a rrible indictment in this matter against the Christian Church.

'It had been boldly predicted by some of the early Christians that the conversion of the world would lead to the establishment of perfect peace. In looking back, with our present experience, we are driven to the melancholy conclusion that, instead of diminishing the number of wars, ecclesiastical influence has actually and very seriously increased it. We may look in vain for any period since Constantine in which the clergy, as a body, exerted themselves to repress the military spirit, or to prevent or abridge a particular war, with an energy at all comparable to that which they displayed in stimulating the fanaticism of the crusaders, in producing the atrocious massacre of the Albigenses, in embittering the religious contests that followed the Reformation . . . When all qualifications have been fully admitted the broad fact will remain that with the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries.'[1]

II.

The urgent question is—What is the way out? How shall abolish war? Well, there is one way by which we shall *not* olish it, and that is by refusing to think about it—its nature, causes, political, commercial, social and psychological. The fusal to think about it seems to be the attitude taken up by ny young people to-day. A well-known novelist in a singu- ly striking picture of post-war conditions in England, makes representative of the younger generation reply to an older end who was pointing out the danger of a lack of interest in litics and legislation on the part of the rising generation :

'If you're thinking of poison gas and high explosives, you can set your mind at rest. We are not going to be caught in that kind of trap. Those old people who go on building battleships and preparing for the next war will find that we are not interested . . . We shall just laugh if anyone wants to make war against somebody else.'[2]

[1] *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*, Vol. II, 242, 245.
[2] Sir Philip Gibbs : *The Hidden City*, p. 203.

This indeed is to imitate the ostrich with a vengeanc
It is to forget that war can array itself in ideal garments ar
that young and generous hearts have never failed to answ
the appeal of the ideal. If liberty seems to be in danger, s
what you will, men will take up arms, preferring to die rath
than to remain enslaved. What then is the true path to freedo
from this frightful scourge? We must begin by realising t
truth of John Morley's remark that 'no real or permanent bette
ment of the world is possible apart from a *transformation*
spiritual thought.' We must undergo a radical change of min
In Biblical language, we must *repent*, which does not mea
merely that we must be sorry for what has happened, but, as
literally signifies, we must change our thoughts. All the issu
of life are in the last analysis mental and what we think, *that* w
are and *that* we ultimately do. We get down to the roots of o
disorder only by the re-valuation of all values, by a return to t
fundamental simplicities of Christ.

What, then, are some of the thoughts we must abandon f
truer and better ones?

(1) *We must transform our idea of the nature and purpose of war.*

It is true that more than once in the past the soldier has be
a buttress of defence for the weak, but in our time, owing to t
advance in scientific invention of instruments of destruction, t
weak, in the next war—if it should come—will find themselv
without any adequate defence. Powerful gases will be dropp
from the sky and whole populations will be killed or cripple
And if it be said that preparedness is the best preventive of wa
the answer is that so far from preventing war, it is more likely
invite it or to provoke it. In a world such as this it may be nece
sary for good men to take up arms and fight in order to avo
what seems to be something worse, but this should not blind o
eyes to the fact that the fighting is an evil, though it may be
less evil than the loss of liberty. Obviously then the only w
to make war impossible is by an association of nations where
each will regard the rights of the rest. That war develops so
notable virtues, such as sacrifice and courage, cannot be denie
but these are rather the by-products of conflict, and over agai
them we must set the fact that war excites in many the worst a
most degraded of passions.

(2) *We must transform our idea of man's nature.*

The saying that 'man is a fighting animal' has become almost proverb. It is urged that as long as man is what he is he will ht. All life is a battle, and the evolution of the race has been rough a struggle in which the strong have triumphed and the ak have been driven to the wall. Now, biologists generally e agreed that the struggle for existence is one, but only one, the causes at work in organic evolution. They refuse to be- ve, however, that a law operating among plants and animals also a law for man. 'There are two laws,' as Emerson says, ne for man and one for thing,' and if in primitive ages man's hting propensities served a useful end, must he still continue fight now that he has emerged from the stage of the tiger and e ape? On the contrary, the upward urge of evolution calls on him to sublimate the instinct of pugnacity, to turn its tivities into new channels whereby his real enemies may be nquered. What is man? asks the ancient Hebrew poet, and answers that man is a creature made a little lower than super- tural beings, crowned with glory and honour, and that to him s been given lordship over all creation. However intimately may be connected with the lower orders of existence he cannot resolved back again into the sub-human world from which he s emerged, a being endowed with powers of thought and aspi- tion, with all that is meant by a reasonable soul. He belongs to higher order than that of the animal world. What is man's fferentiating quality? Not aggression, but self-sacrifice; not rrender to passion, but submission to the law of reason; not spirit of hatred which injures the hater as well as the hated. ne man who most shows himself to be man is he who would pre- r to suffer wrong than to wrong another, who cleanses his soul envy and jealousy, takes pity on those less privileged than mself, searches for good—not evil—in the hearts of men, ares his good things with the needy and in large-hearted mag- nimity forgives the evil-doer. Apply this principle to inter- tional relations. What kind of nation has a promise of sur- val? Is it the nation that looks askantly at other peoples, at is for ever asserting its presumed rights and for ever aiming a monopoly of political virtue, that is swift to avenge apparent insult and to take advantage of a weak opponent, rather is it not the nation that makes its appeal to justice,

that depends on patience and forbearance and friendly discus sion for the vindication of its claims?

(3) *We must transform our idea of patriotism.*

Dr. Johnson's famous saying that 'patriotism is the last re fuge of scoundrels' has become popular of late, but if ever ther was a true patriot it was the great Doctor himself. There ar two kinds of patriotism—a lower and a higher. The lower typ of patriot boasts of his country's virtues, claims for his ow people all political, social and moral excellence. It is he wh cries out for mighty armaments and stronger weapons of offenc and defence. Too often such patriotism is motived by commer cial greed or a false nationalism. On the other hand our younge intellectuals need to be reminded that there is a higher patriot ism which is the fruit of divine inspiration. Each people has gift to offer on the common altar of humanity and no nation livet or dieth unto itself, for each nation belongs to a fellowship whic modern science is uniting more and more closely together National selfishness is as fatal to a people as personal selfishnes is to an individual. An immense dynamic has been lost throug the idea that ancient Israel was the only elect people of God We are now beginning to see that Rome too was chosen by th Providence that rules in history for a great and noble purpose To her was committed the discipline of law and rule. The an cient Greek people was also elected to serve humanity by th ideals of thought and beauty. And so too with modern nations— each has some splendid contribution to make to the well-bein of the world. God has chosen modern America and Englan as much as He chose Israel, that they too may serve the world What are the ideals by which America lives? Freedom, demo cratic rule, equality of rank and class, government by the whol people and not by a class. These ideals have not yet becom actual, and America is pledged by her very existence to the realisation, but the working out of these principles implies tha America must take her rightful place as one of the great leader and champions of world-peace.

(4) *We must transform our idea of God.*

True patriotism and true internationalism must, if they ar to endure, be built upon the highest possible conception of th Divine, and the only conception possible to civilised and pr

essive man is that which has been manifested in the life and ork of the founder of Christianity. There is a growing con- ction among thoughtful persons that the only possible alter- atives are God as Christ conceived Him or blank Atheism. he Soviet leaders of Russia have made their choice. They ropose to build a state on the negation of any ultimate spiritual ality in the universe, and in doing so they seem to be ignorant the fact that they are flying in the face of all history. The reer of the Hebrew people is the standing contradiction of the oviet doctrine. There were wrong elements in the Jewish notion Deity which generated pride, spiritual exclusiveness, national in-glory; and centuries of suffering were needed to beat these it of a stubborn and intractable race. Yet the fact remains that ecause of their resolute faith in a spiritual power, however in- lequately conceived, they have survived and their oppressors ave vanished. Modern civilisation, unless upheld by a spiritual ith, is doomed to disintegration by the self-created forces of sease, discord, unhappiness and the tedium of existence. Vhere is such a faith to be found? That is the vital question. Vhen Christ appeared as a public teacher, He announced, in e phrase of the earliest Evangelist, the 'Gospel of God.' This eans that He had a message not only *from* God but *about* God, nd it is the business of the Christian Church to make clear this essage so that men may understand it and realise its power. nhappily, the Gospel has suffered in our own time from a ievous deterioration for which modern preaching is, to a great xtent, responsible. The Divine Fatherhood, a truth which lies the heart of the Christian message, has come to mean that God -like a weak and indulgent parent—will not be hard on sinners any event. He will think of their happiness and comfort far ore than of their spiritual perfection. The love of God has een preached in season and out of season, His everlasting ercy has been glorified in hymns and sermons and prayers. eligious people have sentimentalised God, made Him an emo- onal stimulant, a minister—not to religious aspiration but to eligiosity.

It was the war, with all its fiendish horrors, that awoke many om their pleasant slumbers and stirred unwonted questionings. world catastrophe was hard to reconcile with the rule of an asy-going, lenient, benevolent Deity. Why did He not stop

the war as with a wave of the hand? But the war was not stopped till it had run its course and exacted its destined toll. And what of God? 'He stood by and made no sign,' people say. But is not the war itself a sign for those who have eyes to see—a sign that the ethical laws governing humanity cannot be flouted with impunity, that the moral order is the realm of cause and effect, that, as Professor Karl Barth says, 'There is above this absurd and senseless will of the world another which is straight and pure and which, when it once prevails, must have other, wholly other issues than those we see to-day. Out of this will, when it emerges, a new world will arise. There is a will of God which is righteous. This righteous will shrinks from no pain, no bitterness, no calamity if only thereby the evildoer is driven from his evil and made to feel that not in the doing of evil but in the doing of righteousness his happiness really lies. It is true that God hates pain, sickness, physical and mental disharmony and is always pitting His energies against them, but it is also true that these tragic conditions will last as long as men are selfish, sensual, greedy, unjust and cruel. It is right that men should taste of their offences; only thus will they be disenchanted of their glamour and induced to listen to the appeal of righteousness and love. We need to supplement our preaching of the Fatherhood of God with the idea of God as the upholder of the moral order of the world, in which, by an inevitable law, evil produces evil. Righteousness belongs to the very essence of love. It is the eternal genuineness of the Everlasting Mercy.

> 'Lo! sin by sin and sorrow dogged by sorrow—
> And who the end can know?
> The slayer of to-day shall die to-morrow,
> The wage of wrong is woe.'

Let us not underrate the splendid contribution to peace which statesmen, diplomats, publicists and journalists are making. Let us be grateful for the Kellogg Pact and the World Court and the League of Nations, which last is a clear and shining light in a world dark with fear and anxious foreboding; but behind these things there must be a spiritual power to make them effective. Only can men act together with abiding goodwill when they are held fast by a common thought of God and of the supreme purpose of human life. Never was the Prophet more inspired than when he cried: '*God* shall judge among the nations'—then and then only 'nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.'

FÉLI DE LAMENNAIS (II)

ESSAI SUR L'INDIFFÉRENCE.

N my last article I spoke of the oblivion into which Lamennais has fallen — an oblivion not total, indeed, because oken by periodic reappearances of that tragic figure on the ene of human thought; yet an oblivion such that his works nain on library shelves for the use of students and critics, but t for the enlightenment and delectation of the general reader r the young.

And having asked, in that place, why he is so largely forten and only occasionally remembered, I would ask now, in gard to the book which first raised him to glory, the reason of magnificent a success. Does the *Essay on Indifference* justify fame?

When we take the work as a whole (though, actually, the st volume constitutes one independent theme, and the second lume, to which the third and fourth are supplementary, contutes another), do we find in it any true originality or creative nius? And when, under the guidance of Lamennaisian enusiasts, we have searched into the sources of its inspiration; en we have ascribed respectively to Rousseau, to Pascal, to ssuet, to de Bonald, to Chateaubriand, their part in this work, es it contain sufficient elements of its own to rank it amongst e great outstanding creations of the human mind?

Yet if not creative it must have been extraordinarily oppore; it must have spoken a language understandable of those whom it was addressed; it must have uttered a truth that eded uttering; it must have touched a problem that cried for ution; it must have impressed a sense of its author's perality on his surrounding world.

Volume I.

It will be better to take the first and second volumes separly both on account of distinctness of subject, and difference fate.

The first volume blazed like a meteor across the intellectual y, and passed on from France over other lands. It imposed

itself; it won for its author a position of authority in the greate Church on earth—a '*dictature dans l'Église*,' as Abbé Duin has termed it[1]; and neither its influence nor its effect were co fined to that Church. To what is due its success? Not to ar true force of criticism, for the genuine critical spirit is lackin throughout; that spirit which can only judge in virtue of intima understanding and appreciation of the cause or matter in que tion. Lamennais shows no profound understanding of Pr testantism, or Deism, or natural religion, or even of atheism- he hustles and derides; he applies his own measure and declar them all wanting. Perhaps they are, but if so they need oth treatment to prove it.

Not to any philosophical originality or profoundity—w have here no new conception of life and thought. But if w have neither of these two things we have something else—w have, I think, a startling instance of the effect produced by th breaking of a long silence with a loud cry.

The world, and, above all, that country of the world to whic Lamennais belonged, had been busy about many things oth than questions of religious philosophy; but the moment of r action had arrived. Lamennais was not, indeed, alone; he w one of a group; but while others were speaking, it was given him to shout the needed message.

His theme, though fortified by argument (if those argumen really did fortify it), was utterly simple; it was a call to attentio a summons to look. It was a cry to the deaf; an appeal to th blind. It was the living utterance of a living mind, that fe within itself the need it exposed in others; that sought whi proclaiming; that experienced itself the hunger which it e deavoured to excite in others.

Raise your eyes, ye wanderers of a few hours through strange land; raise your eyes, and take not a melancholy pride denying that you have a Fatherland!

And, let it be added, in further explanation of its flami success, that Lamennais was a Chrysostom; an ardent soul spo through a golden mouth.

. . . . . .

[1] *Lamennais, Sa Vie*, etc. F. Duine: Paris, Libraire Garnier.

This first volume of the *Essay on Religious Indifference* peared in 1817, and passed quickly through several editions. contains hints of the philosophy definitely propounded in the cond and following volumes, but it is actually complete in elf; and one of its critics remarked that, in spite of the pro-sed sequel, it could well stand alone.

Its theme is briefly as follows. First of all, a passionate otest against callousness and indifference in regard to any ctrine, but especially in regard to religious doctrine. Our liefs are the source of our actions; on our beliefs depend our nduct, our literature, our laws and constitutions, our civil and cial happiness.

'*A l'égard de la société il n'y a point de doctrine indifférente religion, en morale, en politique*,' and '*l'indifférence, con-lérée comme un état permanent de l'âme, est opposée à la ture de l'homme et destructive de son être*.'

He has a profound remark on what he terms *la logique des tions*—society is fatally bound by its own convictions in a way at the individual is not so bound—*Un individu peut reculer vant les conséquences, la société jamais*.

He resumes the various forms which this deadly indifference n, according to his philosophy, assume. There is the indiffer-ce of the mere opportunist, for whom religious doctrines have purely utilitarian and political value. (We have had political amples of what he thus stoutly terms 'religious indifference' some recent movements. The *Action Française*, for instance, en if it contain considerable elements of earnest religious be-f and practice, has also its element of opportunism; its ten-ncy to subordinate religion to other interests.)

Pragmatism was not to the fore in those days, or it would, doubtedly, have drawn from Lamennais the same vigorous ndemnation.

There is the indifference of those believers in revealed re-ion, who distinguish fundamental from non-fundamental ctrines.

There is the indifference of the Protestant, who is, in the es of Lamennais, just one who sorts out his religion according his own private judgment, without any regard to its social rce and character.

There is the indifference of the Deist, or believer in a purel natural religion; he, too, is a follower of his own merely per sonal lights and instincts.

There is the indifference of the atheist, whose indifferenc assumes a form of positive hostility; and whom Lamennais dis patches as a proud fool!

All these are forms of religious indifference, and our write is almost as severe to those who deny or minimize the importanc of a single doctrine of the Church as to those who deny th very existence of God—and why? Because their fundamenta vice is the same; they put their trust in reason, whereas salvatio is only through authority.

Philosophy—this is the great mental vice of mankind; an in one heap of reprobation are included the great philosopher of Greece with those of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

La seule difficulté qu'on rencontre en combattant les doc trines philosophiques est de les réduire à des maximes fixes e précises. Quand on y est parvenu tout est fait, elles se réfuten d'elles-mêmes.

It is reason, unguided reason, that leads us all astray; tha is the source of variety and confusion, discord and uncertainty For there can be but one true religion, true in every part; an it can be known to us only by the method of authority. Philo sophy starts from ignorance; religion starts from light.

And here we come to a belief which dominates the whole o this work, in all its parts; the belief in a primitive revelation an a golden age of religious faith and social order and peace at th beginning of human history.

We must not suppose, in spite of many seeming assertion to that effect, that Lamennais denies all right use and value t the reasoning faculty. We in our day, as others in their day regard it as a means not only of verification, but also of actua discovery of knowledge and truth. This conception was limited for Lamennais, by his belief in an early period of illuminatio an illumination more positive and practical than the Cathol idea of revelation. He speaks as though this early manifestatio of religious truth had been as plain and irresistible as the ligh of sun or moon; he thinks that it was by a perverse use of reaso that this primitive security was disturbed.

That primitive revelation was later incorporated by God into e Church, which thus became the one source of religious light; ıile the conduct of civil society was confided by God to His ›pointed temporal rulers. Thus we have the two authorities, in the conception of Dante; the religious authority of the ıurch, the political authority of the king; the Church being e source of religious light and certainty; the monarchy of cial order and happiness.

Lamennais ascribes all social miseries to the Revolution, ıd depicts a land of peace and prosperity under the ancient onarchy. The wars of kings seem to leave him unmoved, and e sufferings of the poor are to depend entirely, for their relief, ı the instincts of Christian charity; as indeed, at one time, ey did. Philosophy and revolution—these are the two great iminal forces responsible for the evils of mankind.

We may well be tempted to ask, when we compare this eatise with the later works, whether there were two Lamennais only one. Yet there is, throughout, a thread of connection, r this religious authority becomes, in his second volume, an ıthority based on the unfailing veracity of the common mind mankind; while the sacredness of the monarchy is justified ' the conception of it as the true organ of the general will of ımanity. It is thus, at bottom, the purely individualistic reason ıd will that are arraigned before the tribunal of God and man.

And yet, even so, it is not quite easy to explain the success this book, and that in a country which had known Montaigne, e all-wise, Pascal, the all-seeing; in a country which had ıown great critics, great social reformers, as well as great reli- ous apologists. Is it to be accounted for in virtue of a period somnolence, when all slumbered and slept, until there came ı awakening to forgotten values, and a clamourous shout for l to feed the expiring lamps? I venture on no statement, I erely proffer the suggestion.

The fact stands that, in an age of self-seeking and social ›nvulsion, this man had the strength to convince his hearers at religion mattered, and mattered supremely; and that, if it us mattered, then religious truth also mattered, and religious ›ctrine could not be unimportant even in its least detail.

There are works whose message is for every age; there are

others whose effect is produced in their own time and only per petuated by after-results. This is one of them; and, to quot the words of Abbé Duine:

Son rôle a été celui de toutes les nobles hôtelleries qui ar borent le pavillon de la vérité sur les chemins de la pensé humaine; elle a servi, pour un temps, de caravansérail à quelque uns des pélérins de l'Infini.[2]

We pass then to the second volume, which, unlike its pre decessor, roused as much criticism as admiration, but which i the one whose fame has endured longest.

Volume II.

With trumpet notes Lamennais had proclaimed that religiou indifference was productive of ruin and death to the individua and to human society; that the unbeliever was a kind of monster *demeurer volontairement dans ce doute terrible . . . c'est u délire inexplicable, une démence, une fureur qui n'a pas d nom;* that religion must be true in every particular, and mus therefore be one and universal; that the human reason is no sur guide to truth, which is, on the contrary, imparted by authorit and received by faith.

He now sets himself to make good his promises, and to sho that, if true religion be necessary to man, he has also the mean of discovering it, and that there is a sure method whereby h may recognize it. In short, Lamennais believes, or at any rat persuades himself that he believes, that he has found the philo sopher's stone—the touchstone of utter certainty and final con viction. Nothing less will do for him! His passion for truth vitiated, deviated, by an even stronger passion for that certitud which implies finality.

La certitude est la base essentielle de la raison; car être i certain si l'on connaît, c'est ne pas connaître.

His intolerance of error had the same quality of exaggera tion and impatience which is so ill-suited to the slow pursuit o truth. His was a hurried, tormented soul for which rest alon was true beatitude.

Perhaps men of a more tranquil disposition are more easil contented with the normal human conditions of change an

[2] *Op. cit.*

vement than passionate, discontented souls of the type of nennais: when we are rested we seek movement; when we moving we seek rest. The dying mill-girl, who heard a pious cription of heaven as a beautiful meadow watered by a burb- brook, begged that the brook might be silenced — she had ed in noise, and her heaven must be one of utter stillness. For nennais the only truth worth having was one which was fixed final, and which the mind could contemplate in peace and nce. He did not hold, with St. Leo, that 'he who fancies that has reached the term of his quest, has not truly attained, but broken down in his search.'[3]

To come, then, to the thesis of this celebrated second ume. Let us not forget that Lamennais considers that he has suaded us, in his first volume, of the vital importance of reli- us certainty; and is now proposing a sure way to find it.

The main points may be resumed as follows:

(1) Man needs religious certainty, but his individual facul- are totally inadequate to its attainment — the senses, the lings, the reason are all subject to error: *to prove reason by son is a sophism common to all philosophy, and, as Mon- gne remarks, it is impossible to avoid a vicious circle.*

(2) Yet, while sense and reason fail, nature does not. Those ths which reason would lead us to doubt are under her guard protection. Again he quotes the word of Montaigne, that if n were fool enough to doubt of everything at least he is not ong enough.

(3) *All systems of philosophy lead to absolute doubt;* for nennais regards the philosopher as one who seeks to build a tem of truth on the faculties and reason of the individual. It very curious to note his lack of comprehension of the greatest tems of philosophy that the world has produced — for him ry philosopher was an individualist — *tout court.*

(4) But nature is stronger than reason; she takes the job in nd — and the principle of life is also a principle of truth and tainty.

(And here we have a hint of later spiritual philosophy; the rgsonian philosophy and the philosophy of Action, as we find

[3] See lesson Roman Breviary, Sunday within Octave of Nativity.

it in the works of M. Maurice Blondel and of the Abbé Labe thonniere.)

(5) Reason is helpless in the great quest; or at any rate u aided, individual reason; but man is not alone; he is born in human society, he lives in it; and from it he draws his men and moral and spiritual life even more than his physical existenc

(6) Instinctively and irresistibly we turn to the general co sent of mankind for confirmation of our own notions and perce tions; and every normal mind accepts the verdict of humanity

(7) Society itself is in possession of the fundamental trut of life in virtue of a primitive revelation, and it is in virtue tradition that those truths are preserved and handed to succee ing generations.

Il existe donc nécessairement, pour toutes les intelligenc un ordre de vérités ou de connaissances primitivement révélé c'est à dire reçues originairement de Dieu comme les conditio de la vie.

(8) As those truths are preserved by tradition, so they a revealed by speech:

apprendre à parler c'est apprendre à penser, comme apprend à penser c'est apprendre à croire.

Language was not invented, but revealed; and the ve *to be* is the essence of language as the Eternal Word is t source of being.

Ainsi la pensée, la parole, ont été révélées simultanémen et comme toutes vérités sont en Dieu, qui les connaît ou se co naît lui-même, par sa pensée, son intelligence, dont la paro substantielle, le Verbe, est l'éternelle manifestation, la paro extérieure n'est que le moyen dont se sert la parole divine; la vérité essentielle, pour se communiquer à notre intelligen . . . la parole, le Verbe, est véritablement . . . la lumière q éclaire tout homme venant en ce monde.

The mind of man would languish in eternal sleep were it n roused by speech—(by speech) *his reason is developed, h heart comes to birth, and a being who belonged to the world matter is raised above time and transported into the world eternity.*

(All this theory is, of course, more than merely reminisce of the philosophy of Vicomte de Bonald.)

(9) The authority of human society is grounded on the au-
ority of God, while, at the same time, our knowledge of God
ounded on the testimony of human society and proved by its
iversal consent. Thus we have a circular argument from the
allibility of God to the infallibility of the general reason of
nkind, and from this latter infallibility to the existence of
od.

(10) Yet the circle is not wholly vicious. We have, in all
ses, to seek confirmation of our private perceptions and rea-
ns from the highest authority that we know. As human beings
know of no higher authority than that of mankind — and of
nkind as known to us in our own surroundings. Hence we
e the verdict of human society, and when human society
ims to have received a certain primitive revelation, we accept
at claim, and thus penetrate to a higher source of certainty
ich is divine. Looking on ourselves, just as men, our supreme
thority is humanity, and the alternative is universal doubt, of
ich nature (he does not say it, but one cannot help thinking
, 'who abhors a vacuum,' will not allow. He who would seek
emption from the universal law of authority, the authority of
e general sense of mankind, becomes as *a wandering star that
no longer governed by the laws of gravitation.* Authority is
e law of the mind as attraction is the law of the body.

(11) As it is through tradition that primitive truth is pre-
rved in human society, and by tradition that it is imparted to
succeeding generations, so every family has a tradition lead-
g back to its first ancestors; every people has a similar tradi-
n; and the human race has a tradition which leads back to
od.

(12) Hence the beginning of our mental and spiritual life is
t doubt, but faith; and the source of truth is not reason, but
thority.

*Nous naissons à l'intelligence par la révélation de la vérité;
les vérités premières, reposant sur le témoignage de Dieu, ou
r une autorité infinie, ont une certitude infinie. Elles con-
tuent notre raison, qui ne peut être conçue sans elles, et, révé-
es originairement par la parole, elles se transmettent également
r la parole.*

Donc toute philosophie qui, au lieu d'établir les droits d l'autorité et de recueillir docilement ses décisions, les soumet la raison individuelle, est contraire à la nature des êtres intell gents et tend à les détruire . . . en ramenant . . . l'homme inte lectuel à cet état où l'on a voulu ramener l'homme social; ét d'isolement, de faiblesse . . . où l'homme physique ne peut viv parceque l'homme moral ne peut s'y développer ni s'y conserve

Et ceci nous explique l'apparente contradiction que no avons remarquée entre la raison de l'homme qui l'arrête dans doute, et le penchant irresistible qui le force de croire. Cert la raison, qui est aussi dans la nature même de l'homme, saurait être naturellement opposée à ce penchant, ne saura tendre naturellement à la destruction de l'homme, ou à sa prop destruction; et si néanmoins nous avons observé en elle cet tendance, c'est que, sitôt qu'elle s'isole, elle est dans un ét contre nature, et manque d'une condition nécessaire à son exis ence . . . la raison de l'homme n'est que la raison de la socié dont il fait partie, comme la raison de la société n'est que civilisation.

(13) The individual has, therefore, set before him the choi of two ways only; the way of the isolated, individual reason, the way of authority, which speaks in virtue of the general reas of mankind. By submission to authority the individual ente into his inheritance, and possesses the riches of eternal life. the exercise of his own unaided reason he is led into the wilde ness of doubt and spiritual death.

Nothing in creation is independent of the rest, nothing isolated . . . all beings are bound to one another, and worlds a bound to worlds as words are bound to one another in spee . . . we live in utter dependence on our surroundings.

We have to look out or to look in; to look in is to confi ourselves within the circle of our own feeble powers; to lo out is to enter on the wide inheritance of all humanity.

(14) Hence the price of true life is *obedience.* Our reas *must submit to the general reason which is the reason of G Himself. . . . Instead of beginning by doubt we have to beg by faith. Eternal life is eternal obedience.*

And eternal life is the only true aim of human society and each individual man as a member thereof.

There are, as has been abundantly indicated by students of mennais,[4] many analogies to be drawn between his social as and those of Auguste Comte; but here we come to the nt on which their difference is profound. The true society of manity was for Lamennais, unlike that of Comte, an eternal d spiritual society, of transcendental character, whose ruler d father was God.

(15) Hence the obedience of the individual to society was ch an obedience as St. Paul recommended to the servant and ve—an obedience, not servile, but free and noble, as to God her than man.

(16) Thus also we have to interpret Lamennais' insistence the sacredness of the civil power—which, for him, had no htful organ but that of the monarchical system. As the urch was the supreme authority of human society in its spirit- l character, so was the king the supreme authority of society its civil character. It was a theocratic system of Church and ate—a theocracy through which alone man could attain his n highest destiny.

This is a brief and imperfect *résumé* of a work which exer- ed an overwhelming influence on its age. I have confined rself, in this review, to the first and second volumes—the third d fourth are mostly occupied with historic instances in sup- rt of the leading theme; above all, they insist on that notion a primitive revelation, of, indeed, a kind of golden age of th and innocence. But Lamennais was a poor historian, and ey do not contribute greatly to the force of his thesis. 'The éfense de l'Essai sur l'Indifférence,' published in 1821, before e last volumes, deals with current objections, and has no ecial message of its own.

While the weaknesses of this celebrated work are manifest cannot but be impressed by its presentation of theories that ve since developed in a very different way from that which mennais would have followed.

He was one of the fathers of Ultramontanism; he was also e of the forerunners of modern Communism. As to Commun- n, he, like, Comte, had a prevision of social doctrines which

[4] See especially the *Life of Lamennais*, by the Hon. William Gibson w Lord Ashbourne).

have taken a more concrete form in our day. The all-importar of society in their scheme of life, the complete subordination the individual in its regard, have taken another form in t 'religion' of out-and-out Communism. For a kind of religior is, and not even totally devoid of a transcendental charact though totally terrestrial in its aims. For the Communist, socie on earth is the sum of human life, in which, and for which, t individual exists — with Comte this notion of humanity took a quasi-divine form and a sacredness of its own; for Lamenn it was not in itself divine, but a manifestation of the Divine hence, in his scheme, the individual was not disinherited, b through society was united to God in eternal life.

His ultramontanism has also passed on into another fo than that which he had conceived; though some of his crit well foretold its eventual outcome. No one put his finger on t weak point more accurately than Senancourt, when he said Lamennais' theory.

It is true that, under immediate divine authority, there wou be an admirable order . . . but, God does not govern direct and the power here invoked under such magnificent terms, c be nothing else on earth than a 'sacerdocratie.' [5]

Lamennais lived to experience certain bitter results of own teaching; he recoiled from many of his own positions, y he never learned one lesson nor abandoned his alchemistic b lief in the philosopher's stone of certitude and finality.

There is a qualified, a relative finality we can all of rightly desire and, to some extent, attain. That is to say, we c build a house, we can cover it with a roof and close it with door, and then shut ourselves in and call it a home—and a ho it truly is. But we know, unless we are mad, that our home not the world, though a good enough home for us; and if we truly alive we shall have windows to our home as well as doo and, indeed, a hut is never truly a home. And thus with c country, and thus with our Church — the place we live in, t place we pray in — the place from which we look out on s rounding immensity — glad, deeply glad, of our refuge, but mistaking it for the universe.

[5] Quoted by Christian Maréchal in *La Dispute de l'Essai sur l'Indif ence.*

And this is where Lamennais fails, this is what is lacking to work we have been considering—it is lacking in the sense *mmensity*. Its author shows us, truly, the feebleness of the ividual mind, and its need of society for the lowest as well he highest conditions of life; but he forgot that the littleness he individual in relation to human society is as nothing to the eness of human society itself in relation to the universe. w expect finality of such a dot in the midst of immensity? how much less great he was than Pascal in expecting it.

In history as in science, in philosophy as in theology, Lamens missed the complication of greatness, the obscurity of vasts. He was not wrong in his sense of the need of limitations uman life is based on them; but he was wrong in attempting enclose the infinite within those limitations—or rather, to be re just, in endeavouring to stretch those limitations to the ensions of the infinite. He did not see that there could be lief in honest doubt,' nor that faith 'should exceed grasp, or at's a heaven for?' Had he taken his home for what it really s, he might have been able to stay in it; he took it for what it ld never be, and hence his endless wanderings.

M. D. Petre.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY*

By the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

'The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.'—Rev. xix, 10.

THE application of Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was unibtedly of supreme importance to the writers of the New stament. The Messiahship of Jesus was the great question issue between the earliest Christians and other Jews. The w was explicit: a man hanged on a tree was the curse of God. e who had so suffered could not possibly be the Messiah. r Jews this obstacle to belief in Jesus was insuperable: for ristians it was removed by the Resurrection. But the un-

*A sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, uary 26th, 1930, on the foundation of the late Dr. J. D. Macbride, ncipal of Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

supported preaching of Christian belief could not render th Divine Law meaningless, nor overcome the Jewish belief th there were no Old Testament prophecies of a suffering Messia Primitive Christians were also Jews, sharing common views the authority of Scripture, and common methods of exegesi Hence for those who accepted Jesus as Messiah, the obligatio to prove the fact from prophecy was as urgent as its successf discharge would have been influential in the persuasion of Jew Success might have been greater had the Prophets not bee over-shadowed by the Law and the traditions of the Elders.

The argument from prophecy, even within the pages of th New Testament, has already far advanced towards that earl maturity in which it was to remain until modern times. In i developed form, it can be seen in Justin Martyr's Dialogue wi the Jew Trypho. Justin does not refer by name to any book the New Testament except the Apocalypse: the Gospels h calls the 'Memorials' of the Apostles, and seems to imply th the writers were inspired, but he writes as if their simplest stat ments must find a basis in the Old Testament. It appears th the entire Christian message was really hidden in the Old Test ment under fantastic mysteries, types and symbols. From Ge xix, 24: '*The Lord rained upon Sodom brimstone and fire fro the Lord*,' he proves our Lord's divinity. A hostile eighteenth century writer observed that 'Justin applied all the sticks an pieces of wood in the Old Testament to the Cross.' The exag geration is temperate. Moses' rod, Jacob's wand, his staff an his dream-ladder, Judah's wand, David's rod, the wood whi Elisha threw into the river, are all applied in this way. Tryph naturally complains that while God's words were sacred, Justin exegesis of them was artificial. Much of his exegesis has ceas to be explication, and ingenuity of imagination has become th principal support of truth. If we would find among the Fathe an example of the application of prophecy to our Lord, such we can still employ to-day, it is the school of Antioch to whi we naturally turn, and we find it in Theodore of Mopsuesti He saw the inner meaning of Old Testament prophecy in inspired hope, not in mysterious prediction. God prophesies deeds rather than by words. Historical events were a dim r velation of the future; and the prophets were led to expre

emselves 'in larger terms' than would have been warranted uninspired consideration of contemporary circumstances. heodore recognizes, as clearly as we do, that much of the ap- ication of prophecy by the New Testament writers is only fective as illustration. It is a tragedy that the charge of Nes- rianism entirely destroyed the influence of Theodore; for his titude to the use of prophecy, and many of his conclusions ncerning it, were only recovered fourteen hundred years later, the cost of infinite labour, acute controversy, and much loss faith.

Justin Martyr's method of dealing with the Old Testament came general. Whatever the measure of its early effect upon e Jews, from time to time, and in our own day, the Jews have rned it against the historical truth of the Gospel portrait of sus, and the Christian estimate of Jesus. A modern Jewish riter, commenting on the Gospels, states that in order to sup- ort the dogmatic positions of Christianity '*many incidents were tually invented "in order that there might be fulfilled" in m prophecies relating to a Messiah of a character quite other an that of which Jesus either claimed or was represented by s disciples to be.*'[1] Moreover, this Jewish argument appears derive considerable support from the opinions of the most cent school of New Testament critics. These critics, having signed to the methods adopted by their immediate predeces- rs their appropriate place in antiquity, maintain that the leged facts which even the earliest strata in the Gospels relate e really shot through with the interpretative hypotheses and tions of the writers. It is precisely this interpretative present- ion of alleged facts that Jewish commentators and the most re- nt modernity challenge; and if the true facts are not recover- le with sufficient probability to enable us to pronounce the terpretative hypotheses to have been reasonable if not un- oidable, those hypotheses will not be accepted on their own thority as final.

The interpretative hypothesis which was of transcendent im- ortance in the early Church was not only that Jesus was the

[1] *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Vol. VII, p. 160, col. 2. *Cf.* Vol. IV, p. 51, l. 2: 'his whole life was reconstructed and woven together out of Messi- ic passages of the Scriptures.'

Messiah, and more than the Messiah, but that his coming, hi life and the Christian doctrine about him, had all been predicte in the Old Testament. It therefore appears to me by no mean alien to the intentions of the founder of this sermon that preacher should enquire in what sense, or to what extent, th 'argument from prophecy,' as used in early Christian apolo getics, was employed or sanctioned by our Lord; and whethe it was attributed to him by the Evangelists in a way that ha modified the Gospel presentation of Jesus to such an extent tha the true facts are not recoverable. For the Christian doctrin of the Incarnation will not be convincingly maintained in th modern world, even upon an accepted basis of Theism, unles the study of the Gospels issues in the conviction that Jesus wa really such as to render that doctrine not unreasonable. To tha conviction it will be impossible to attain, if what the Gospel reveal of the character, teaching and self-consciousness of Jesus is really interpretative hypothesis, elaborated on the basis of view of Messianic prophecy which has now lost its meaning— the work of people who, on grounds either unknown to us o such as would not convince us, had persuaded themselves tha Jesus was their expected Messiah.

Now it is very remarkable that in what is probably the earlies written cycle of the traditions about Jesus which has survived namely, that common to Matthew and Luke which is not derive from Mark, there is but one suggestion that Jesus himself use the argument from prophecy. After insisting on the greatnes of John the Baptist, Jesus says of him :

> *'This is he of whom it is written, "Behold I send my messenge before thy face, who shall prepare the way before thee."'*

In the opening verses of Mark, the same words appear as th Evangelist's opinion of John.[2] The quotation is not exact. Th Hebrew of Malachi reads '*the way before ME*,' the LXX, '*way before MY face*.' What in the originals is a reference t one who shall prepare the way before Yahweh, is thus turne into an address by Yahweh to the Messiah. The considerabl use of the Holy Scripture which Jesus made suggests that h did not manipulate it in this way. Even if he did use this quota tion in the way attributed to him, it is scarcely representative o

[2] Matt. xi, 10; *cf.* Luke vii, 27; *cf.* Mark i, 2.

e argument from prophecy' as used by the Evangelists. ere is no reason to doubt that the ministry of the Baptist l precede that of Jesus. The quotation from Malachi is not ed as a *proof* of the office of John: it is rather an adaptation the words of the prophet to illustrate the true greatness of hn as more than a prophet, on which Jesus had been insisting. is source of tradition, 'Q,' nowhere else manifests interest the argument from prophecy, though it is essentially Jewish, d is dominated by the thought that Jesus is Messiah, and ough it contains exalted claims of Jesus, explicit and implied.

I will review briefly the passages in Mark, in Matthew and Luke, in which Jesus is represented as appealing to prophecy ich must be fulfilled.

(1) Immediately after the Transfiguration, in which Moses d Elijah are seen with Jesus, we read:

> *And they asked him, The Scribes say that Elijah must first come. And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: and how is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at nought? But I say unto you that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him.'* [3]

atthew omits the '*How is it written?*' and '*even as it is written him*' possibly because nothing appropriate had been written Elijah, though it is not often that Matthew is baffled by that fficulty. He adds a note, '*Then understood the disciples that spake unto them of John the Baptist.*' Jesus rationalizes the pectation of Elijah's return, giving no hope of a real return of at prophet. This is the more remarkable as the vision of Elijah the Transfiguration might have suggested a literal fulfilment. ne only Elijah who would come had already come, and, so far om any prophecy concerning him receiving any detailed fulfil- ent, the people had done to John *whatsoever they listed.*

(2) '*The Son of Man goeth, even as it is written of him.*' atthew reproduces the saying, while Luke has '*goeth as it has en determined.*'[4] No Old Testament prophecy is obviously plicable, nor is one indicated.

(3) '*I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took e not: but this is done that the scriptures might be fulfilled.*'[5]

[3] Mark iv, 11 *ff*; Matt. xvii, 10 *ff*.
[4] Mark xiv, 21; Matt. xxvi, 24; Luke xxii, 22.
[5] Mark xiv, 49; Matt. xxvi, 56.

We observe the same absence of an explicit reference to a Scripture which is thus to be fulfilled, and the remark is a strang one to have addressed to the band who had come to arrest hi Again Matthew repeats it, but Luke, with no reference to t Scriptures, has '*But this is your hour and the power of darkness*

(4) In Matthew xxvi, 54, Jesus, after saying that a pray could secure the assistance of twelve legions of angels, add '*How then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it mu be?*' This saying has no parallels in Mark and Luke, and aga we note that there is no suggestion of any particular Scriptu which must be fulfilled.

(5) Luke xviii, 31. '*Behold we go up to Jerusalem and things that are written in the prophets shall be accomplish unto the Son of Man.*' And there follows a detailed forecast Jesus of his passion, death and resurrection. Later the for casted details are recorded to have actually occurred. The forecasts by Jesus appear also in Mark and Matthew, and ther as also when they appear elsewhere in Luke, no reference Scripture is made. In itself this might suggest that it is t Evangelist, rather than Jesus, who makes the reference; a there is general agreement that the precise forms of Jesus' for casts of his own passion have been written up with knowled of what actually happened. That Jesus explained it all in det and with references to predictive prophecy is rendered incre ible, for Luke expressly says of the prediction of the passio '*And they understood none of these things; and this saying w hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were sai*

It is, I think, sufficiently clear in all these instances in whi Jesus is represented as appealing to Scripture which must fulfilled, that the language is general, even formal, and th there are no precise citations, or artificial adaptations, of a prophecies. There is simply the unexplained conviction that forthcoming death accords with the testimony of Scripture. Jesus really uttered these sayings, it is hard to see that th could have had useful meaning except for those already w instructed in the use of the proof from Scripture; and we sh notice a tradition that the disciples were not so instructed un after the Resurrection. Their lack of understanding agrees w

[6] Luke xxii, 53.

ıe documentary evidence; both support the conclusion that this ɔrm of 'proof' was not regularly used by Jesus, if at all. We now the type of Messianic hope cherished by the disciples, and they came to regard Jesus as their Messiah, such references ɔ his suffering would have been to them as novel, abhorrent and ven unmeaning as to other Jews.

There remain only two passages in which there is reference ɔ particular words of the Old Testament, in connexion with the ppeal, in the mouth of Jesus, to the fulfilment of Scripture.

The first is Mark xiv, 27. '*Jesus saith to them, All ye shall e offended; for it is written, "I will smite the shepherd, and ıe sheep shall be scattered abroad."*' Matthew repeats this ayıng: Luke omits it. Here again the words of the Old Testaıent have been changed to suit their Christian use. The form *I will smite*' agrees neither with the Hebrew nor the Greek. o conservative a scholar as the late Dr. Swete agreed that this ɔrm of the text was probably taken from a collection of proof exts, or *Testimonia*, which was made when the argument from rophecy had been established. Jesus may have foreseen the ight of the disciples, but there is no discoverable reason why e should have pronounced it necessary because an obscure prohecy, with adaptation, could be made to suggest it. But there as a very real reason why the primitive Christian community ıould have valued this predetermination of the disciples' ɔwardice. Their action, in itself discreditable, was less dis-editable if inevitable. A similar use of prophecy is made to xplain the betrayal.

The second passage is Luke xxii, 37. '*For I say unto you ıat this which is written must be fulfilled in me. "And he was eckoned with the transgressors," for that which concerneth me ath fulfilment.*' It is represented as spoken by Jesus in conrmation of his advice, with which its connexion is far from clear, ɔ sell their clothes and buy swords. Jesus does not say it was xpressly written concerning him; but that what had been ritten of the Servant, must have its accomplishment in him. 'he actual phrase '*that which concerneth me*' is peculiar to this xt, though the plural '*the things concerning Jesus*' is a Lucan ırase, found twice in ch. 24 and four times in Acts, where it efers to the death and resurrection of Christ. But if this citation

from the Second Isaiah really goes back to Jesus, it is all of piece with the other passages we have reviewed.[7]

There can be little doubt that the mind of Jesus was steeped in the Old Testament, and particularly in the spirit of the prophets. But that he thought of himself as fulfilling detailed prophecies, and of the Old Testament as a storehouse of argument to support his claims is without justification from the Synoptic Gospels even as they stand, apart from the application of critical theories. Such an attitude would have given to the life of Jesus a slavish artificiality which is contradicted by his use of the Old Testament in other connexions, and by his attitude to the most sacred Law. The use of prophecy *attributed to Jesus* is of a different order from the examples which *the Evangelists give* of prophecies fulfilled by him, and different also from the use made of prophecy in the New Testament generally and in the early Church. Indeed, had he wished to support his claims and teaching on the ground that the circumstances of his life accorded with Messianic prophecy, he must have used those which were accepted as Messianic. Of such, not one appears in his mouth. Had he conceived the idea that his life was to be moulded by prophecies accepted as Messianic, he must needs have played a part very different from his actual life, or else ultimately abandoned the Messianic claim.

But the Gospels themselves contain a tradition that the argument from prophecy arose after the Resurrection, when experience of that event had brought the disciples together again with renewed faith. The 24th chapter of St. Luke represents instruction in this 'proof' as still necessary, and as given by the risen Christ. He begins with Moses and all the prophets, and expounds, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself—

[7] *Cf.* also the incident in the Synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv, 16 *ff*) Jesus reads from Isaiah lxi, '*The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor: He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, And recovering of sight to the blind, To set at liberty them that are bruised. To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.*' And he adds: '*To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears*' This reading from Isaiah is as remarkable for the place at which it ends as it is extremely apt as a summary of Jesus' mission. He does not suggest that his mission *must* follow these lines because it has been foretold, but simply states as a fact the fulfilment of a 'prophecy' which, from its very nature, would find many fulfilments.

hat he was by Scripture destined to suffer and to enter into his lory. The same detailed instruction is given to the Apostles in erusalem as well as to the disciples on the Emmaus road. When uke continues his narrative in Acts, practically every step in he story is consciously brought into relation with prophecy. The same tradition appears in the Fourth Gospel. We read, *When therefore he was raised from the dead'* the disciples, ecalling some words spoken during his earthly life, '*believed he scripture.*'[8] When this Gospel relates the Triumphal Entry s the fulfilment of prophecy, the author says explicitly, '*These hings understood not his disciples at first: but when Jesus was lorified, then remembered they that these things were written f him, and that they had done these things unto him.*'[9] Equally ignificant are the words which follow the statement that the eloved disciple '*believed*' when he saw the empty tomb: '*For s yet they knew not the scripture that he must rise again from he dead.*'[10] Clearly, then, no explicit teaching about the relaion of his death and resurrection to prophecy had been given by esus. Justin Martyr also repeats this tradition that the risen ord 'taught the disciples to read the prophecies in which all hings were foretold as about to happen.'[11]

Now it will have been observed that the passages in which esus is represented as appealing to Scripture as being fulfilled, hough in the most general way, all concern his passion. This s not accidental. Even for those who had companied with him, is sufferings and death presented grave difficulties. The Resurection reassured them. But the difficulties, particularly in reaching Jesus that he is the Christ, were only overcome when was recognized that his sufferings and death were in accordnce with what had been divinely decreed for the Messiah, and nade known by the prophets. But this recognition only came, nd could only come, with a reading of the Old Testament in an ntirely new light, at which there is no hint that the disciples rrived during the earthly life of Jesus. It was belief in the esurrection which renewed their faith, and made a new underanding possible. The Easter faith provides the historically ecessary presupposition for the employment, and even the reognition, of the argument from prophecy. In this sense it is

[8] John ii, 22. [9] John xii, 16. [10] John xx, 9. [11] *Apology* i, ch. 50.

correctly attributed to the risen Jesus : *it is never referred bac to his earthly life, except in a vague and general way.* That should be so is at least very remarkable testimony that, in on important respect, *the Gospels have not irrecoverably obscure the facts they purport to relate.* The writers do not represent o Lord's use of prophecy as identical with, or even in any wa resembling, that which was undoubtedly their own use of it. W may not unreasonably feel that the prevalence of the appeal prophecy has modified incidents in the life of Jesus, perhaps some instances even created the forms in which the tradition h come down to us. But it was not prophecy so used which creat the conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus; for that use of pr phecy was only made possible when the conviction had alread been established on other grounds. The most important fact that an interpretative hypothesis, a form of argument so powe ful and so prevalent, has *not* been unhistorically read back in the words of Jesus : and when critics, Jewish or others, asse that the delineation of the character and self-consciousness Jesus, and the main elements of his teaching, are as much more the result of interpretative hypothesis than of fact, we ha one excellent reason for suggesting that such assertions are me rather to be further considered by them than assented unto by u

The Messianic hope was wider than any particular pr phecies which give it expression : wider also than the hope of personal Messiah. It was bound up with that process, uniq in history, whereby a Semitic tribe came to recognize its God the only Maker and Ruler of heaven and earth and of all that therein. The Jews, through the medium of prophecy, becam the first great monotheistic people. The prophets, with th intense consciousness of the divine Providence, gained an i sight into the nature, will, and purpose of God which enabl them to read contemporary events, and to frame their futu hopes, in accordance with their spiritual vision, though they we not unconditioned by personal and contemporary circumstanc Their prophecies were often of the nature of moral and spiritu laws, which were and are fulfilled in *many* and in various way They saw direct divine intervention in events : our own grea concern with secondary causes need not blind us as to the tru in the prophetic consciousness. The communion of the hum

th the divine is an essential part of religion. The divine tivity in prophecy was wrought through that communion, which ers an indefinite scope for the divine guidance of the world in iritual things. For the divine revelation through prophecy we ed not postulate any miraculous transmission of knowledge of e future, or anything more than God's operation on the deepest rings of human life.

In what sense can we apply the Messianic Hope to Christ? will not delineate the various and inconsistent forms in which at Hope found expression in the time of our Lord. He both cognized and claimed to fulfil the prophetic character of the ld Testament, though not in the narrow sense of fulfilling olated and detailed predictive sayings. He appealed to pro-ecy as revealing God's providential plan. He frequently otes from the Prophets and the Psalms, and sometimes uses e language of the Old Testament without actually quoting it. is use of it is exactly what we should expect from what we have eady reviewed :

> *'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.'* (Matt. v, 17.)

is freedom from subservience to the letter of the Law is mani-st. What was said '*by them of old time*' is superseded by *say unto you*.' He joins the prophets with the law as objects his fulfilment, and there is no reason to suppose that he ful-led the one in a manner essentially different from the other. ophecy was of profound significance, for it announced the ths which made possible the true understanding of his life d mission. It is obvious that his life did not fulfil, with any actness, any contemporary form of Messianism. Some forms it he criticized and definitely set aside; some forms of it, the nguage of which he used, he necessarily transformed by the ct that his conception of God is utterly different from the God the Apocalypses. Possibly he consciously introduced ideas ich had not hitherto been included in the Messianic Hope. is certain that, just as when the Fourth Evangelist says '*the ord was made flesh*' in Jesus, by that statement 'the Logos' sumes a meaning it had never exactly embraced before, so en it is said 'Jesus is the Messiah,' that title assumes a mean-g which, in the totality of its content, is *new*. Neither its pre-

cise nor its full meaning will ever be discovered by exclusi attention to contemporary Messianic conceptions. His fulfilme is not by direct correspondence with earlier conceptions, r solely through a spiritual development of any one of them, b by a combination and transcendence of divergent, almost co tradictory, lines of earlier and contemporary thought and hop

That Christ is the fulfilment of prophecy must, in the l resort, rest simply and solely upon his power of self-authenti tion, upon the appeal which his character, his implied clai and his teaching can make to the mind or spirit of man. T religion which bears his name and has carried the messages Israel's prophets to the ends of the earth—and in that resp alone has fulfilled many of the noblest of the prophecies—t religion means much more to us than the actual words of Ch and his original Apostles: it has taken up much from oth sources. But all that is best in it has grown out of what was s and done by Jesus. There were treasures of wisdom and knowledge and of art of which his consciousness did not kno Much that is of value, and even necessary for the good of hum life, finds no place in his life or in his teaching. But neverthel the Church's doctrine concerning him depends, in the last reso upon the fact that in the actual circumstances of his own eart life he both lived out and taught the central purpose of hum life, into relation with which *all* else must be brought, if it is realize its full potentiality. I do not suggest that the judgm that this is so is the only link in that chain of factors which ju fies the Church's faith in Christ; but it is and will remain most important link, and the one on which all others depend their constraining influence upon faith. To him the prophec point, but that they do so, that he fulfils them, and that Divine sovereignty in the world to which the prophets look forward will be realized through him and his teaching—this only be revealed to us by the same Spirit who spake by the p phets, who dwelleth in us and beareth witness with our spirit

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RESURRECTION OF MAN*

Does not the higher criticism and especially the development of the tical faculty in academic circles prove disastrous to traditional religious iefs? It is a very wide-spread and popular conviction that it does. ould we not then leave traditional belief and teaching uncriticized?

'We mar the beauteous forms of things
We murder to dissect.'

w although we are compelled to assent to the statement that the higher ticism does prove disastrous to traditional religious beliefs, yet that is t the same as saying that it proves disastrous to all religious beliefs. It nly disastrous to those religious beliefs that cannot justify themselves at e bar of criticism. Those that can meet its challenge come forth with en-nced vitality as the result of the ordeal.

Of English higher critics none is more erudite and none more courageous an Archdeacon R. H. Charles, but equally none has a stronger conviction the reality and supreme value of spiritual religion. It is this which gives articular value to his latest volume, *The Resurrection of Man*. This con-ts of twenty-two sermons; twenty-one of which were preached in West-nster Abbey; the other before the University of Oxford. The first nine rmons or studies deal with the resurrection of man. They are full of erest and freshness, and although they demand a great body of learning their composer, yet they are written in a style that any educated person n easily follow. With the approach of Easter, we would particularly direct e busy parish priest to these studies. In the one hundred and eleven pages ich they comprise, he will find not only stimulus for himself, but enough d more than enough to enable him as preacher to guide his congregations rough the Easter season.

Another very valuable group of studies, five in number, deals with the ok of Jeremiah. Another group consists of three lectures on John Wy-ffe. The remaining sermons on 'Messianic prophecy,' 'God's Commis-n to the Prophet and in some measure to every man,' 'Two different pes of men who answer Christ's Call,' 'No Reservation in God's Ser-ce,' 'The Need of Loving God with the mind,' complete a volume which epens the sense of the reality and value of religion.

The volume contains many *obiter dicta*. Dr. Charles deals in the follow-g paragraph with what has puzzled some thoughtful students of religious olution:

'What is not essential to the life of a religion in its earlier stages may d often does become essential in its fuller development. Even in the Old stament we have a partial illustration of this truth. The author of *clesiastes* and the author of the 88th Psalm rejected the new belief in a ure life, and though nominally they remained theists, they became philo-phical pessimists.' Dr. Charles remarks that he cannot hope to secure e acceptance of his teaching in Tennessee or Rome: 'The Bible is not a relation but the history of a Divine Revelation, ever advancing from even gan beliefs and practices to others of the highest spiritual character.' That his answer to Tennessee. His answer to Rome runs thus: 'There is no

* *The Resurrection of Man and other Sermons.* By the Ven. R. H. Charles, D.D., .A. (Published T. & T. Clark, 1930. Price 7/-.)

such thing as an infallible system of doctrine. No such system has be entrusted to any Church, least of all to a Church which changes its requi ments for communion nearly every century. In any case it is the Chri like life to which the Divine promises are made.' 'No Church,' Dr. Char asserts, 'can be truly Catholic which lays the chief emphasis on the acce ance of certain intellectual formulas.' Perhaps the most interesting of th interesting sermons is the exposition of Mt. xiii, 44-46. It contrasts finder of hidden treasure with the seeker of goodly pearls.

H.D.A.M.

THE RELIGION OF JESUS.*

There are many causes of hope for a revival of personal if not insti tional religion, and not the least is the rediscovery, through New Tes ment criticism, of the Jesus of history. Many books have been publish in recent years, reconstructing the life of Jesus. Dr. Bundy has n attempted the not less useful, though far more difficult, task of analysi the religious experience that lies behind the life and teaching of Jesus.

Like many others to-day, Dr. Bundy finds his inspiration not in t theories which have grown up around the figure of Jesus, and which n form the orthodox theology of the Church, but in the example of the ligion of Jesus, which as he says sets a much higher and harder standa 'Jesus did not demand that his followers believe *in* him or *on* him, b that they believe *with* him.' 'It is much more comfortable to confess *religion about Jesus* than it is to strive to live *the religion of Jesus* af him.' The book deserves to be widely read, perhaps most for the la chapters on Western Christianity and on Discipleship, in which the wri contrasts the religion of Jesus with the religion which has grown up rou his name in the Church. He writes that the historical student feels 'th the Church has never esteemed its Lord too highly, but that it has ma of Jesus something that he never was as a matter of historical fact, a that in the process the Church has turned a deaf ear to his call to discip ship.' 'At the hands of the Western World the person of Jesus has s fered the paradoxical fate of being deified and denied at the same time.'

It is not easy to represent at second-hand the religious genius of a man, least of all of this one man; and it is no severe criticism to say th perhaps Dr. Bundy has not been entirely successful. At times the analy of the religious outlook of Jesus seems a little long, and a reader may tempted to wonder whether, after all, a historical survey of the life Jesus does not succeed better in giving the religious outlook by implicati and suggestion than does a direct attempt to analyse the religion. Th are one or two cases, notably with regard to the saying, 'To give his l a ransom for many,' where the author seems guilty of rejecting the a thenticity of a saying, not on the evidence, but to suit his theories. It a minor criticism that the style of the book is sometimes distressingly a terative; often a good phrase results, as when the Golden Rule is said be 'as promptly praised as it is poorly practised'; a phrase, however, l 'programs and propaganda, conferences and committees, surveys a statistics, methods and merely mechanical means' sets one's mind looki out for similar alliterations in the text, and not looking in vain.

Dr. Bundy is at no pains to conceal the fact that the historical portra as he sees it, does not always accord with the later scheme of thou which has grown up about and around that portrait. The miraculous,

* *The Religion of Jesus*. By Walter E. Bundy, D.D. pp. 361. (Cassell & Co., L London: 1929. Price 12/6.)

irruptive sense, is eliminated from his picture; the feeding of the five ousand is dismissed with the epigram that 'in such a case we have to do ot with miraculous multiplication but with devotional division.' More- er, as the very phrase 'the religion of Jesus' must at once suggest, ere is in the portrait a clear consciousness by Jesus of his distinction om God. 'The sense of native and natural human limitation runs through e whole of the Gospel story.' 'Between himself and God, Jesus draws e line which the truly religious consciousness always draws between it- lf and its deity.'

When Jesus came to earth, the religious institution to which he came ossessed a traditional mould of Messianic expectation. Neither the baby the manger nor the carpenter's son of Nazareth accorded with their con- ntions of the divine. Judaism, therefore, rejected Jesus, but the followers Jesus went out to transform the world with his message, and Judaism as left on one side. To-day, once again, there is a rigid mould of traditional ought about Jesus. But there is also being reborn into the world, as a sult of Gospel criticism, a fresh understanding of the Jesus of history. here are many to-day who, like Dr. Bundy, take for their inspiration and uidance the religion of Jesus, his faith in God and his hope for the King- om; they do not, however, admit traditional Christo-centric theorising, hich they think Jesus himself would have been the last to desire, nor a octrine of the divinity of Jesus in a form which would make nonsense of s having any religion which other men could follow. Shall the Church ject the portrait in which Dr. Bundy and many others find their inspira- on? Shall she expel from her fellowship those who, like Dr. Bundy, do ot take their stand on any theory about the divinity of Jesus and who ink it more important to give living allegiance to the religion and way of e of Jesus? In other words, shall the Church say once again, this time ith regard to the rediscovered portrait of Jesus, that unless the Messiah cords with her conventions of Messianic dignity, he is no Messiah? Dr. undy will have done us a very great service if he forces us to face these uestions. If the religious institutions of to-day do once again prefer con- ntional, traditional theories about the Messiah, they may once again cceed in expelling from their midst those who seek honestly to follow e Messiah as he really was and is. If, however, the Church does prefer follow the path of Judaism, limiting the action of God to her con- ntions, she must expect the fate of Judaism; the conventional religion out Jesus will be left again on one side, and it will be those who are spired by the religion of Jesus who will go forth with his faith to trans- rm the world. G.F.A.

WOODBINE WILLY.*

Many things are said of Ripon Hall, often by people who have a very perficial knowledge of it. One thing its critics will be interested to learn. ipon had a share in producing Studdert Kennedy. He never forgot what e owed to his theological home. Long after the war, at the height of his me, he admitted to the writer of this review of *Kennedy by his Friends* at the lectures he attended on the Philosophy of Religion at Ripon formed e veritable stuff out of which his theology was subsequently made. Few the contributors to this volume would care to be labelled 'Modernist,' nd probably they would not advise promising ordinands to enter Ripon all, yet they yield unstinted homage to the work and worth of the best nown of Ripon's sons.

**G. A. Studdert-Kennedy.* By his Friends. (Hodder & Stoughton, 1929).

As this book is being widely read and discussed, it may appear unnece sary to draw attention to it. But there are points which cannot be too plain accentuated, especially in these days when, in many religious circles, the is a most unfortunate 'defeatist' atmosphere.

These points for our learning will be found in the chapters dealing wit Kennedy as a War Padre and the lucid summary of his teaching by th Archbishop of York. Kennedy was clearly in the succession of those wh from the time of St. Paul have not been afraid to handle the core of an crisis. In this instance, the War and the average man in khaki were th decisive point. Kennedy went straight for this. The whole of his teachin was coloured by it. Without this context, his message, manner and metho are meaningless, and indeed sinister. Modernists concerned with the un fortunate hiatus existing between the religion of sweet reasonableness a enunciated at a Girton Conference and a British public blown about b every breeze of scepticism and superstition, not to mention carnality, ma take heart from the crusade of Kennedy. Whilst the Modernist valu abstract truth, he is often tempted to ignore concrete truth, but truth d humanized is only a pale ghost occasionally beheld at *séances* of the *intell genzia*. The Archbishop of York shows how all that Modernists have co tended for took flesh in the preaching of Kennedy. Nothing could be tru or more effective than his treatment of Prayer, where he and Robertson Brighton are one. Some may boggle at Kennedy's strong Sacramentalism We doubt whether it was more to him than a framework. At any ra his Eucharistic teaching emphasizes the human and practical aspects of th rite.

Modernists will also be interested to note how another of their plank themes was handled—the limitation of God in this world of time and spac We cannot here subject to detailed examination Kennedy's Theology an Christology. Examined, we have little doubt of the verdict. Kennedy wa the greatest of popular expounders of Modernism. Let his success hearte others. The pulpit can still command influence. A.T.W.D.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MODERNIST POLICY.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

With reference to your (December) article, 'Should Modernists hav a policy?' I would like to suggest that not only should they advocate a ne Creed, as you propose—(a Creed which, I believe, would be accepted b most of the laymen who do not go to Church now)—but that they shou also engage themselves with the whole structure of the Church Service which require remodelling in the light of the new Creed.

As you very truly say, Christianity must have some verbal form affirmation, and this should not conflict with the best knowledge of th time. The strength of your Creed lies in the fact that it agrees with th best knowledge of the time and is also part of the faith delivered to th Saints. Personally, as a business man in a very difficult position, I shou like to see something specific included about seeking first the Kingdom God: it is the one thing that needs constant repetition in a business man life. 'Losing one's life to save it' is frightfully difficult for a man wh lives in an atmosphere of fierce opposition and competition.

I think a vast number of laymen would also like to see a new series of ticles and hymns springing from the new Creed and better interpretative sic. One of the most potent causes of our bad music is that it tries to erpret false things. Get our Creeds right, and our music will get fresh erpreters. At present, it is positive agony for a reasonably well-educated l musical person to endure the service at the great majority of the urches. I have given up trying. And finally, what about the Com-nion Service itself? Surely this has to be wholly reconstructed? Can it be made to spring direct from the Creed, to agree with our knowledge the 'ascent of man,' and to convey the essential principle of sacrifice hout relying on its pagan inheritance?

With every good wish for your most important work and the journal.

R. C. BRISTOW.

Hotel des Princes,
Nice, France.
25th February, 1930.

BIBLICAL MIDDLEMEN.

,

The article which has struck me in this month's issue is the one en-ed 'Biblical Middlemen,' and, as such a Middleman, I thought that per-ps my experience might interest your readers.

For some years past, I have specialised in the Old Testament and have tured on it from the modern point of view, and though as a Middleman ave not appealed either to patrons or bishops, yet I have found that the nk and file of Church people are extremely interested, indeed, far more than we are accustomed to think them. The modern interpretation of Bible appeals to them intensely.

Last Lent I received an invitation from a parish which is extremely angelical and fundamentalist, and I gave a course of seven lectures on first eleven chapters of Genesis in the light of modern thought. The es of the lectures were as follows :—

(1) Inspiration.
(2) Landmarks in the development of thought from 1485 A.D.
(3) Two nineteenth century shocks : Higher criticism and Darwin's evolution.
(4) The Creation Stories : Derived from Babylonian sources and in the light of Geology and Biology.
(5) The World Scheme.
(6) Man in the light of philosophy.
(7) The Teaching of Gen. i to xi.

I expected to find that the numbers would dwindle as the time went on, that we should have very few in church ; yet the numbers increased, and must have had an average attendance of about 140. They have asked back this Lent to continue the course, and that is a good sign. I hope go and continue the course on Old Testament in the light of Archaeology l common sense Criticism.

At present, I am giving a course of twelve lectures on the same subject l at a similar church, and so far we have had an average of about a ndred, many more than usually come for a week-day evening service.

My experience all along for the past twenty years has been that the linary church-goer is just waiting for some reasonable interpretation of Bible which will accord with his common sense.

At one of my recent lectures, when I told my audience that the wo was not made in six days, and that the opening words of *Genesis* i mea not the beginning of things, as is usually understood, but just a stage the creative process, I expected that some would walk out or at least t there would be an out-cry; but no, I was asked to explain, and I did and I think convinced them that such an exposition was the right one.

Now that the Archbishops have sent their letter round to each incu bent, we may find that things will move. We have to remember that ordinary parson has neither the time nor the inclination, nor, perchan the brains, to deal with these matters. Moreover, in a diocese, if wants promotion, one must 'take *a real interest in the affairs of the d cese*'; and to be a Biblical Middleman is not to commend oneself to d cesan officialdom. To do that one must be interested in the quota. work of the Biblical Middleman, as the writer says, is one which must done with caution, for why upset the faith of any? It is a splendid w and is well worth doing, for in doing it one is building up the faith of people on a foundation which will stand in the day of stress.

I trust that you will forgive me for this long and wandering and parently egotistical letter, but I felt bound to write to you, and here it

ONE OF THE MIDDLEMEN

OPEN COMMUNION.

SIR,

In your issue of December last, you refer to the matter of Open Co munion, and, unless I mistake your words, you infer that it is not p mitted in the Church of England. I am writing really for information, I have long been under the impression that legally every British citizen, England at least, is entitled to the ministrations of the Established Chur and therefore has a right to be admitted to the Communion. I am aw that in the end of the Confirmation Service there are express directions to who may be admitted to Holy Communion, but are these, of necessi binding upon everyone? Do they invalidate the legal right which, unles am mistaken, is the possession of the citizen who is not necessarily Churchman?

Am I wrong in assuming that the Church of England as it is now ' tablished' gives the right of Communion first and foremost, unconditi ally, to everyone who wishes to be admitted, if they are members of nation; though a smaller part of the nation, calling itself the Church, certain conditions and bye-laws (if I may use the term) which cannot, h ever, invalidate the right first given? F.R.S

[It is quite true that everyone living in an English parish is entitled to ministrations of the parochial clergy, if he desires to be baptised, pared for Confirmation, visited when sick, etc., but *not unconditiona e.g.* to be confirmed he must first be baptised; to be married he m first make certain declarations and conform to certain legal requireme He certainly is not entitled to receive the Holy Communion unless h baptised, and if he have been baptised with the English Prayer B Service he must also have been confirmed, or be ready and willing t confirmed before being admitted to Holy Communion. Of course, t is much evidence in support of admitting to Holy Communion in English Church those communicants of other bodies who have not b confirmed, but desire to receive the Holy Communion in the Churc England, either because their own Church Services are not access or because they desire to unite with English Churchmen in the servic

hristian Fellowship. Our correspondent will find many instances of this ted in Archdeacon Hunkin's recently published book, *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in relation to Inter-Communion and Reunion* Heffers, Cambridge).—Ed., *M.C.*]

PHYSICS AND DETERMINISM.

Perhaps you will permit me a few comments upon the interesting letter n Mr. G. A. Byron under the title 'Physics and Determinism' in the number of the *Modern Churchman.*

I do not think that the Archdeacon of Coventry has gone a bit too far he conclusion he draws from the principle of Indeterminacy as discussed Professor Eddington in his great book, *The Nature of the Physical rld.*

On page 220 of that work he writes: 'A particle may have position or ıay have velocity, but it cannot, in any exact sense, have both.'

On page 294 he writes: 'It is in consequence of the advent of the ntum theory that physics is no longer pledged to a scheme of deter- istic law.' Now if the position of the particle is to be determined for future, *both* these data must be *exactly* known. Professor Eddington ws that both cannot be known, and *why* they cannot be known. 'The gestion is' (says Eddington) 'that an association of exact position with ct momentum can never be discovered by us, *because there is no such ıg in Nature'* (Eddington's italics) (page 225).

Revolutionary consequences are involved, and physicists are not afraid face them. For instance, Professor A. H. Compton, one of America's st brilliant investigators, points out that it is *meaningless* to speak of definite path of a particle. Henceforward, physicists are on their guard inst the use of meaningless terms. This, says Eddington, is the lesson ch Einstein has taught them. Dr. Langmuir also insists that the con- t of cause and effect, hitherto universally accepted in science, has lost meaning. He says ('Science') that if phenomena are to be described in ns of ordinary space and time, causality has to be abandoned, and mic processes are governed by the law of 'probability.' Hitherto, men science chose for the operations phenomena in which such enormous ıbers of individual quantum phenomena were grouped together that the ılt could be determined by their averages. Eddington calls these results ıtistical laws.'

The Professor of Mathematics at Harvard University, recently writing the significance of the Quantum Theory, says: 'My thesis is that the of Newton is coming to a close, and that recent scientific discoveries e in store for us an even greater revolution than that effected by New- . The revolution that now confronts us arises from the recent dis- ery of new facts, the only interpretation of which is that our conviction t nature is understandable and subject to law arose from the narrowness ur horizons, and that if we sufficiently extend our range we shall find t nature is intrinsically and in its elements neither understandable nor ject to law.'

Doubtless the professor uses the word 'law' in its scientific sense. At best, as Eddington points out, we are only dealing with symbols whose mate nature is beyond the powers of the human mind to comprehend.

Fredk. Stephens.

39 Rue St. Charles, Paris.

26th January, 1930.

PHYSICS AND DETERMINISM.

SIR,

Mr. Stephens' very interesting reply to my letter under the above t makes it abundantly clear that the Archdeacon of Coventry has stated c rectly Professor Eddington's teaching: it does not, however, appear to to answer my questioning of the validity of the deduction drawn fr ignorance.

May I be allowed to quote in my support the words of a great physic Sir J. J. Thomson, O.M., which were broadcasted as recently as the 2 of January last (reported in *The Listener*, Vol. 3, No. 55, p. 179), wh are as follows:—

'The immeasurables of to-day may be the measurables of to-morr A striking example of this is that a movement was started by so chemists at the end of last century to give up thinking in terms of Atomic Theory, on the ground that the mass of an atom could not measured. By the irony of fate, the movement had hardly begun whe method of measuring the mass was discovered. *It is dangerous to bas philosophy on the assumption that what I know not can never be kn ledge'* (my italics).

Lewes. G. A. BYRON

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION COUNCIL ELECTION, 1930.

SIR,

I shall be obliged if you will give publicity to the following offi notice to members of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

By the Constitution the following elected members of the Council re on the day of the Annual General Meeting (May 28th, 1930), and are *eligible for re-election, viz.*:— Sir Reginald Antrobus, Rev. C. Bass, N. Sykes, Mr. H. F. Walker, Mr. Douglas White. Mr. W. F. Stiff, v was also elected in 1927, but resigned recently, is not eligible for election.

The following were co-opted to the Council for the current year, retire on May 28th, but are *eligible for election, viz.*:— Rev. H. Ans Rev. J. S. Bezzant, Hon. G. Coleridge, Mr. A. Floyd, Sir Lawrence Jo Dr. Longford, Canon Storr.

All other members of the Council (whose names are printed on cover of *The Modern Churchman*) continue to serve.

Ten members of the Council are to be elected this year, and nomi tions of candidates must reach the Secretary not later than March 1st. names must be proposed and seconded by members of the Union. If m than ten nominations are received, voting papers will be sent to all m bers of the Union.

Attention is drawn to the shortness of the period available for nomination of candidates.

T. J. WOOD,

The Church House, Westminster. *Organising Secretary*

February 1st, 1930.

CORRECTION.

In last month's notice of *A Short Bible*, published by Basil Blackw it was commended because 222 pages of good print were supplied for 2 it should have been 570.—ED., *M.C.*